

JUN 13 '32 C

# RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A Journal Devoted to the Development of  
Character through the Family, the Church,  
the School and Other Community Agencies

JUNE, 1932



## CONVENTION ADDRESSES

JOHN H. FINLEY

GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM

J. V. MOLDENHAWER

FRED J. KELLY

JAMES M. GILLIS

LOUIS L. MANN

GEORGE JOHNSON

## ADDRESSES—LOS ANGELES CONFERENCES

PHILIP A. PARSONS

JACOB KOHN

M. WILLARD LAMPE

LEWIS B. HILLIS

## EDITORIAL COMMENT AND NEWS NOTES

BOOK REVIEWS

R. E. A. FORUM

# Religious Education

Seeks to present, on an adequate, scientific plane, those factors which make for improvement in religious and moral education. The journal does not defend particular points of view, contributors alone being responsible for opinions expressed in their articles. It gives its authors entire freedom of expression, without official endorsement of any sort.

Articles in *Religious Education* are indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX, which is on file in educational institutions and public libraries.

## Editorial Staff

J. M. ARTMAN  
J. W. F. DAVIES

O. D. FOSTER  
JULIA WAXMAN

## Editorial Committee

ARTHUR J. TODD, <i>Chairman</i> <i>Professor of Sociology, Northwestern University</i>	EVANSTON, ILLINOIS
EDWARD SCRIBNER AMES <i>Professor of Philosophy, University of Chicago, and Pastor, University Church, Disciples of Christ</i>	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
A. J. BRUMBAUGH <i>Dean of Students in the College, University of Chicago</i>	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
GEORGE A. COE <i>Professor of Religious Education (retired), Teachers College, Columbia University</i>	EVANSTON, ILLINOIS
HEDLEY S. DIMOCK <i>Professor of Religious Education, Y. M. C. A. College</i>	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
A. R. GILLILAND <i>Professor of Psychology, Northwestern University</i>	EVANSTON, ILLINOIS
SOLOMON GOLDMAN <i>Rabbi, Anshe Emet Congregation</i>	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
JOHN A. LAPP <i>Author and Editor</i>	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
S. R. LOGAN <i>Assistant Superintendent of Schools</i>	WINNETKA, ILLINOIS
ALBERT Z. MANN <i>Professor of Sociology and Home Missions, Garrett Biblical Institute</i>	EVANSTON, ILLINOIS
CURTIS W. REESE <i>Dean, Abraham Lincoln Centre</i>	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
PHILIP L. SEMAN <i>Director, Jewish People's Institute</i>	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

## The Religious Education Association

Publication Office, 404 N. Wesley Ave., Mount Morris, Ill.  
Editorial Office, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Illinois

# RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

VOLUME XXVII

June, 1932

NUMBER 6

## CONTENTS

EDITORIAL COMMENT AND NEWS NOTES.....	483
ADDRESSES—THE 1932 CONVENTION:	
<i>The Spirit of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Convention.....</i>	John H. Finley 490
<i>A Statement of the Situation.....</i>	George W. Wickersham 493
<i>The Moral Life in Perspective.....</i>	J. V. Moldenhawer 499
<i>A Theistic Basis of Morality.....</i>	James M. Gillis 505
<i>The Future of Religion.....</i>	Louis L. Mann 511
<i>Consequences of Education without Religion.....</i>	George Johnson 515
<i>Shall We Teach Pre-Determined Social-Economic Goals and Policies?.....</i>	Fred J. Kelly 518
ADDRESSES—THE LOS ANGELES CONFERENCES:	
<i>Common Needs and Objectives of Church and State in Higher Education .....</i>	Philip A. Parsons 524
<i>Religious Education.....</i>	Jacob Kohn 531
<i>An Experiment in Cooperation within a State University.....</i>	M. Willard Lampe 536
<i>Trends in the Relation of Education and Religion.....</i>	Lewis B. Hillis 541
TOWARD A THEORY OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AT STATE UNIVERSITIES.....	Edward W. Blakeman 548
THE R. E. A. FORUM.....	556
BOOK REVIEWS .....	558
CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE.....	574

*Religious Education is issued on the tenth of each month, except July and August.*

*The Religious Education Association publishes this journal, maintains an exhibit library and bureau of information, conducts annual conventions; directs research and serves as a clearing house for information in the field.*

*Membership in the Association, including the journal, is \$5.00 per year. Single copy of journal sixty cents.*

*Correspondence regarding articles should be addressed to the Editorial Staff.*

*Entered as second-class matter Sept. 19, 1931, at the post office at Mount Morris, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.*

COPYRIGHT 1932, BY THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

## *Watch For Later Announcements In Your Journal*

OF importance to every reader of *Religious Education*, and to all those who *should* be R. E. A. members, is the word that selected groups from each seminar are still delving into the significance of the findings of the Wickersham Report. . . that the completed work of these groups will constitute a genuine appraisal of these findings. . . and that these valuable studies will be reported as quickly as possible in later journal issues.

It is expected that all, or a major portion of an issue will be devoted to each study.

The journal will carry notice in advance of publication that you may be sure of not missing a word of it.

Those of your friends who have not yet joined the R. E. A. should know about this valuable material that they may arrange to secure it through early membership. As a real favor to them, and to us, will you so inform them?

VOLUME XXVII  
NUMBER 6



JUNE  
1932

# RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

---

## EDITORIAL COMMENT AND NEWS NOTES

**The Twenty-ninth Annual Convention**  
**T**HE proceedings of our Twenty-ninth Annual Convention, held at Columbia University, May 3, 4, and 5, will not appear in this journal in their entirety because the seminar groups desire to carry on until carefully considered reports on the problems assigned can be presented. However, the majority of the platform addresses are presented in this issue. The reports of the seminars will appear in later numbers.

The Convention was used to make a beginning in interpreting the significance of the findings of the Wickersham report for the religious and character education agencies of the country. It is highly gratifying, therefore, that a selected group from each seminar will carry on until a genuine appraisal of the situation revealed by these findings can be given us. No doubt a single seminar report will occupy all or a major part of an issue of the Journal.

Notice will be given in advance of publication of each of these reports. Because of the importance of these questions for religious and moral education, our

Journal will be invaluable to leaders in these coming months. Persons who have not yet joined our group should know about the work in progress.

While the Board of Directors has expressed the appreciation of the Association by letter, we want to thank all in New York City who helped to make the recent Convention a success. Columbia University is to be congratulated on having such officers to act as hosts. The Convention owed much of its success to the wonderful way the University anticipated every need. Mr. H. E. Evans, who acted in a double capacity—first as secretary of the program committee and second, for the University—gave invaluable help.

Mr. Victor F. Ridder and Mr. Robert E. Simon, chairmen respectively of the all New York Committee and the Program Committee, merit our special appreciation. It was through their work that the Convention reached the thinking public. Mr. Ridder contacted many groups. The banquet, held on the first evening of the Convention, with 601 selected persons from all groups in attendance, was the result

of the fine work that had been done.

The greeting by President Butler, in which he recalled the statesmanship of President Harper in visioning and initiating the Religious Education Association, was a high point in the dinner occasion and brought us sharply to the educational needs of our time.

And what next? We have discovered in the findings of the Wickersham report certain breakdowns in our educational results. Will the seminar reports be sufficient to set us right in our educational procedure? Or will we need to spend months and even years in further study? Surely we cannot go on with "the sanctions of conduct weakening and no new sanctions" to take their place; with the blurred and chaotic notions of right and wrong; with the moral world of the child defeating instead of helping us; with law used as a cudgel and whip and education asleep; and with the procedures of penal institutions making the criminal more criminal.

If we are to be competent in education we will need to face up squarely and fully to the facts as revealed in the findings of the Wickersham report.—*J. M. Artman*



#### Religion and State Education

**R**ELIGION and education are in for a thoroughgoing stock taking as to their share of responsibility for our present crisis quite as much as, if indeed not more than, business, politics, or international relations. After all, have our churches and schools been any more true to their trust than the banks and great corporations have been to theirs? In fact, all over America discerning thinkers are saying they have not been. If so, great is their responsibility, for by their influence—or failure to influence, as the case may be—this avalanche has come upon us. Where education is compulsory and religion is optional obvious consequences follow. Where the state laws are interpreted as outlawing the teaching of sectarianism to be the outlawing of religion in its own

system of universal education, consequent undermining attitudes toward this conservator of sanctions essential to organized society incubate swarms of stinging problems. To change the figure, if religion is to be brought formally into our state education it must be bootlegged, and today the bootlegger—even in religion—is not viewed with universal approval.

While no one advocates the introduction of sectarianism into state education, an ever-growing number of leaders in all schools are lamenting the loss of the idealism religion has to make to youth, and are anxious to learn how the values of religion may be had in state education without doing violence to our generally accepted principle of separation of Church and State. The obvious inadequacy of our present state education to produce responsible citizens is lessening the numbers as well as the enthusiasm of those who see red when the word religion is connected to the word education by a co-ordinating conjunction.

There is a growing conviction among all groups—both of church and state—that education requires a stronger injection of idealism into it and a deeper sense of stewardship if we are to have a responsible citizenry. It is also becoming more generally recognized that religion—as understood by the three great historical groups in America—is the conservation and stimulation of idealism and unselfish service as no other force is. A state, therefore, which, by the enactment of law, deprives its citizens-in-the-making of this indispensable means of attaining the highest type of character, may well take stock of its resources and liabilities in its educational philosophy.

So far as we can see now, a much safer and saner philosophy of state education can be built around the slogan "cooperation without compromise." Our laws no way prohibit co-operation in letter but actually imply it in spirit. Our army, navy, courts, penal institutions—all take it for granted that the state co-operates with idealistic influences and agencies,

including the religious upon which the security of our very foundations of society rest.

The only sane approach to our problem is to use to the maximum the existing machinery—all the time improving it to secure better results! The state educational institutions are permanent—assuming the continuance of our present order—and the churches and synagogues appear to give equal promise of surviving. These tremendous powers are for use. The debunkers and iconoclasts see their weakness and declare them useless and obstacles, yet have no constructive suggestions or program to take their place. The parasitic substitutes that have been attempted have had little to command them and have been of short duration.

The church and school—both as educational and character building institutions—must undertake their sacred task *together* more seriously. Neither can shirk or delegate its responsibility or program to any other agency without experiencing just such loss as we now most painfully are. Both must enlighten and both must enhearten on a co-operative basis of mutual understanding. The churches can ill afford to let a situation grow up where their youth cannot do this and where they must seek *outside* agencies through which to express their idealism. The alienation—through whatever transitory substitute—of the youth from the church or synagogue is fatal to both, but worse for the youth.

A serious situation obtains in that the school (or university) and the church are so frequently set off over against each other. The church and school are both servants in a common community. When they work at cross purposes they become divisive, sectional, and fail in their greatest usefulness. Unless they can be brought into a more co-operative mood and program than at present, their supporters may well question the advisability of continuing their support. More economy, efficiency, and character will be necessary before the sacrifices required

to secure the funds for their continued support will be forthcoming. The issue can be side-stepped no longer.

The Los Angeles Conferences described in the May journal were brought into existence to propose for consideration some of the problems and issues involved in the general theme—"Religion and State Education." The papers and speeches—some of which are in this journal—were the expression of the authors' opinions only. No resolutions were adopted or votes of approval or disapproval taken by any of the conferences. So these papers stand on their own merits. They are given for what they are worth and stimulate. It is hoped they may bring to the editorial desks many letters and articles bearing upon the problems they discuss. We covet the stimulation of your best thinking for our guidance.—O. D. Foster

\* \* \*

#### Supporting Research Projects

INQUIRIES come to us in increasing numbers seeking suggestions on ways and means of continuing research projects which have been auspiciously begun and which promise splendid results, but which must be abandoned because of the lack of funds either from state appropriations or from private sources. The extent to which these studies are going by default is unknown to the public. Unfortunately the basic research projects upon which advancement along idealistic lines have relied so much are going along with the rest. No doubt many of the various "projects" may be abandoned with little or no loss and perhaps with gain to society, but others can be given up only to our national misfortune.

Highly trained experts who have given their lives in preparation for and to the development of a technique and of an instrument of great importance for the betterment of the race are not only finding themselves without funds to carry on their projects but are even facing the problem of maintaining or securing a

connection that will bring their bread and shelter. Many of these technicians, essential in their places, are among the most helpless to meet the untried conditions of a work-a-day world and are in grave danger of being in want.

Here, as in every other phase of human existence, the innocent have to suffer with the guilty. One has only to be around for a brief time the office of a great foundation whose function it is to assist research projects, to learn that many apparently worthy appeals are at bottom injurious rackets. We have learned, all too late, that enormous sums have been spent in "research" which in reality were worse than wasted in giving drones encouragement in their parasitic practices. To sift the wheat from the chaff large funds must be spent annually when these necessarily diverted funds would go far toward constructive work. The sad feature is that there must be so much waste when the worthy are being neglected because of the handicap being put upon them by the unworthy. Men whose very lives and service are invaluable to the nation are even more likely to be consigned to the bread line than those who, by virtue of their cunning, press their claims more successfully, but whose "work" could quite as profitably be neglected.

However much we desire, it seems to be increasingly difficult to give encouragement to technicians during these days of stress. With the tobogganning of incomes, that which promises the greatest returns for the relief of the greatest numbers will likely get the most favorable consideration. Perhaps necessity is bringing upon us the subordination of technique in highly specialized fields to the more careful study of the broader and more comprehensive needs of the masses. While education has had none too much technique, it is growing increasingly obvious that it has had too little integration and general purposive planning.

What can be done about it? Who knows? Foundations try to sift the wheat from the chaff. Technical experts

continue to create projects and appeal for support. With the increasing economic stress will come a comparable increase in projects. In the days of plenty, misjudging the merits of a case was not so serious, but when every dollar must be weighed in relation to the results to be had with its expenditure tremendous responsibility rests upon the one in the fortunate position of benefactor, as well as upon the one presuming to present a project worthy of consideration in a time of so great national need.

A congress of character developing agencies and survey experts might materially assist the benefactors in evaluating the relative merits of the numerous projects and "experts" these benefactors, whether individual, foundation, or state, are implored to support. Would you favor a move on the part of the R. E. A. in this direction, perhaps some time during the World's Fair in Chicago, the Summer of 1933?—*Editorial Staff*

\* \* \*

#### Thirty-sixth Annual Convention of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers

THE National Congress of Parents and Teachers which met in Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 15-20, 1932, directed the attention of all their departments and standing committees to a study of "Safeguarding Childhood through This Crisis." Besides cross demonstration of Parent-Teacher work through magnificent exhibits on both state and local work from all over the nation, the various committees turned their attention to how the Parent-Teacher movement could protect childhood from the dire effects of the economic crisis. Such questions as the "impaired efficiency of the schools through withdrawal of funds"; "impaired health" because of undernourishment, overcrowding, etc.; moral discouragement and spiritual insecurity as seen in the loss of confidence in others; the terrible saddling of debts upon the coming generations; the physical and

spiritual undermining of the home and community; the necessity of studying the ultimate results of the Eighteenth Amendment, and the danger to childhood in uncontrolled alcohol.

The Congress, after much deliberation, passed the resolutions listed below. The significance of these lies in the fact that they really become a charter for the ensuing work of the Parent-Teacher organizations of the country.

\* \* \*

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers recognizes its obligation to safeguard youth through the crisis created by an economic stringency; it pledges continued effort to sustain whatever has been gained in material advantages for the childhood of America and dedicates itself anew to the advancement of those intangibles which bring to childhood and youth an appreciation of true life values which are not in any wise dependent upon the financial conditions of the nation.

Realizing that the public school is the ideal instrument for the development of an enlightened citizenship, we pledge our hearty support to the maintenance of public schools at a standard consistent with the efficient training of youth, urging strict economy in administration in order that terms of school need not be shortened and that the entire program of physical, mental, vocational and character training may be maintained. We reaffirm our devotion to the ideals of the Congress as set forth in its by-laws and in the seven-fold program of home and school and accept once more the challenge to translate into a program of activity the provisions of the Children's Charter to the end that every child shall have equal opportunity to develop a wholesome and happy adjustment to society. We pledge ourselves to a study of economic problems that we may attain the understanding which will enable us to assist in their intelligent solution.

#### I. SAFEGUARDING CHILDHOOD THROUGH THE HOME

1. Every child is entitled to the security of a home and the opportunity to grow up in a family with adequate standards of living; therefore we believe that the state and federal governments must take cognizance of the present unemployment situation to the end that every wage earner may have an opportunity to earn a living adequate to the needs of his family as the surest safeguard against social handicaps for the child.

2. We call attention to the protection for child health that only a home can give and urge parents to make use of help and instruction offered by recognized authorities in this field. We ask that parents everywhere safeguard the physical and mental health of the

child through carefully planned programs of work, recreation and rest; by protecting his personality; and by assuming responsibility for the establishment of standards of life.

3. Recognizing the effect of economic conditions on growth and development with special reference to the pre-school child we urge increased attention to the Summer Round-up and recommend that local units make strenuous efforts to see that remedial defects of preschool children be corrected and that wherever possible provisions be made for those cases whose parents are unable to meet the financial burden of medical, dental or surgical care.

4. Recognizing the tremendous importance of the home in conserving and developing child life we pledge ourselves to support in every possible way the maintenance and expansion of Homemaking Education in the public school and urge school administrators to make adequate and equitable provision for such instruction.

5. We observe with alarm the increase of crime and tragedy among the youth of our country incident to the possession of firearms. We urge that the attention of parents be directed to the menace to life through deadly weapons in the hands of minors and irresponsible persons.

6. We reaffirm our confidence in the highly desirable outcomes of an effective program in vocational guidance based upon the interests, abilities, and aptitudes of youth and call upon the home to recognize and cooperate with this service.

7. We believe that it is the responsibility for all parents and teachers to rear children in respect for authority and obedience to law; and in recognition of this, the 200th anniversary of the birth of George Washington, we advocate such programs of character education as shall inculcate those noble characteristics exemplified in the life of the Founder of this Republic.

8. We believe that the spiritual training of the child is supremely important; that religion is the mainspring of life; that every child has a right to a faith, and a right to understand and share his spiritual heritage. We therefore urge parents to cultivate in their children the highest spiritual values.

#### II. SAFEGUARDING CHILDHOOD THROUGH THE SCHOOL

1. We express our profound appreciation of the resolution of commendation of the program and work of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers unanimously adopted by the convention of the Department of Superintendence in 1932. Recognizing cooperation between home and school as a major objective of the Congress, we call upon superintendents, principals, and teachers everywhere for such assistance as will result in the organization of a Congress unit in every school.

2. We recognize the added responsibilities that are being carried by the teachers of the nation during this period of economic adjust-

ment and we desire to record our appreciation of their unselfish service to the children of the nation. We stand for teachers of training, character and culture; for adequate tenure and retirement laws and for a single salary schedule for all teachers of equal training and experience, regardless of sex.

3. We deplore the drastic reductions recently made by Congress in the appropriations for the Office of Education which will not only weaken its efficiency but actually cut off many activities of great value to education. In our judgment this constitutes a grave discrimination against a service to education which never has been sufficient to meet the needs. We urge Congress at the earliest opportunity to remedy this situation.

4. The National Advisory Committee on Education, appointed in May, 1929, by the Secretary of the Interior to study the relation of the federal government to education has vitally contributed to the progress of education. Its final report entitled "Federal Relations to Education" recommends a federal department of education with a secretary in the president's cabinet, and urges that the control and administration of education remain with the states. We reaffirm our belief that the establishment of such a department would contribute greatly to efficiency and economy in the administration of education and we urge a nation-wide study of the findings and recommendations of this important document.

5. Since the ability to earn a livelihood is of basic importance in the development of a socially useful person, we believe it is imperative that education in the vocations as well as in the general art of living be made an integral part of the programs of all school systems.

### III. SAFEGUARDING CHILDHOOD THROUGH THE COMMUNITY

1. Trends in parent education indicate the need for its correlation with other social movements. We therefore recommend that the Congress, through its intelligent and informed membership, guide such correlation and thereby further the better integration between home, school and community.

2. Recognizing the tendency of state and local governments to reduce appropriations for protection and promotion of public health, particularly those appropriations affecting child and maternal health, we recommend that strenuous efforts be made to protect such appropriations from undue and unreasonable reductions.

3. We believe in such cooperative effort as will develop safety attitudes and skills among children and adults for their protection while at work and play.

4. We urge our association throughout the country to strive vigorously for the maintenance, and where need demands it, for the increase of those services of municipal government which have to do with recreation since public recreation centers and playgrounds are a vital factor in maintaining community morale and contribute to health

and happiness of childhood and the family. We urge the increasing use of the public schools as recreation centers under trained leadership and urge further effort to provide adequate play areas for the needs of childhood.

5. We believe that the essential services of existing libraries must be safeguarded in this period when people are turning to books as never before, and that library opportunity must be extended to rural people through the establishment of county libraries.

6. We stand for cleaner and better motion pictures; condemn indecent appeals in motion picture advertising; and declare our disapproval of the system of blind-booking and block-booking of films.

7. We believe that radio is a form of education and should be used to enrich and extend home and community life; that the broadcasting channels should be properly regulated by national and state authorities and freed from objectionable advertising.

8. We recommend an active program of education in school and home as to the effects of alcoholic liquor on safety, health and character. We urge the strict and impartial enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment.

9. We reaffirm our stand that separate detention homes should be provided for all children who need such care and that judges qualified by training and experience should preside over juvenile court cases. We believe that special attention should be given to the treatment of juveniles in federal custody and that under no circumstances should they be confined in prisons with adult offenders.

10. We urge that pending the ratification of the child labor amendment to the United States Constitution, state branches work for the passage of state laws which will protect children from exploitation.

11. Realizing the importance to future generations of children of creating and fostering friendly attitudes among the peoples of the world, we call upon our members to further in every way possible the worldwide crusade for child welfare through education inaugurated and carried on by the International Federation of Home and School; and to this end we urge that parents and teachers lend their influence to promote in every land intelligent cooperation, community improvement, the training of parents, the education of public opinion in order that together we may attain our universal goal—the unity of all education in the life of the child in home, school and community.

\* \* \*

### Sixth Annual Iowa State Conference

THE sixth annual Iowa State Conference on Child Development and Parent Education will convene at Iowa City, Iowa, June 21, 22, and 23, 1932, under the auspices of the Iowa State Council for Child Study and Parent Edu-

cation. The Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, the Extension Divisions of Iowa State College and the State University of Iowa, and the Iowa State Teachers College will co-operate in the meetings.

The lecture topics will be: "Professional Problems in Parent Education," "Feeding the Family During Depression," "The Effect Upon the Child of Changes in Economic Organization," "Child Health and Protection in the State of Iowa," "Mental Hygiene in the Community and State," "Mental Hygiene and the Individual Child," "Growing Up With Your Children," "Your Child in a Changing World," "What the Community Does to the Child," "A Sociologist Looks to the Future," "The Visiting Teacher."

The round table discussions will take up "Professional Problems in Parent Education," "Minimal Diet Essentials," "Mental Hygiene," "Sex Education," "The Community and the Child," "The Visiting Teacher."

#### Summer Pastors' Institute

PASTORS who wish to "brush up" but who cannot give an entire academic term to resident study will be provided an opportunity in the projected Summer Pastors' Institute to be conducted August 1-7 jointly by the Divinity School of The University of Chicago and the Chicago Theological Seminary. While both institutions have for years separately conducted many institutes and conferences for pastors, this will be the first time that they have conducted such a Summer Institute jointly. It is being undertaken at the suggestion and request of many pastors who wish to keep in touch with current trends in religious thought and church practice.

The program, as planned, will be interesting and stimulating. Attention will be directed particularly to concrete problems with which the minister is faced in his church and community. Preaching, pastoral work, and the newer techniques introduced by the psychiatrist, mental hygienist and personal counsellor will be given especial consideration.

\* \* \*



---

## THE SPIRIT OF THE TWENTY-NINTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

JOHN H. FINLEY

I THINK that we should remember first of all to-night that Dr. William R. Harper led in the founding of the Religious Education Association. In a Life written by Professor Goodspeed of the University of Chicago it is stated that in the spring and summer of 1902 he was constantly discussing whether there should not be a broader movement toward the improvement of religious instruction in the United States. He found that there was such unanimity among the hundreds of persons with whom he communicated that a call was made for a convention. He engaged the Auditorium, a great hall in Chicago, and "it was crowded to hear men of the first rank discuss a subject which had hitherto been left to Sunday School enthusiasts."

I used to hear him at Chautauqua, where without any art of rhetoric or grace of oratory he would hold thousands by the sheer appeal of his lectures on the Bible, especially the Prophets. He was himself one of the Major Prophets. If he had lived he would be leading us to-day—and he would be only seventy-seven years of age.

Those who were associated with him in this movement, whether major or minor prophets, and those who have carried on with this purpose which possessed him, have sought during these twenty-nine years to open paths, or rather highways such as the prophet Isaiah saw in his vision, into ever richer realms of divine and human relationships—for the individual as well as for the organized agencies of religious and character education. Specifically this fellowship has developed chairs of moral and religious education in the colleges; transformed the International Sunday School Association; reorganized the Sunday School work of the denominations; created a new type of religious activity in the Christian Associations; stirred public education to its moral responsibility; and become the fellowship of the pioneers in moral and religious education. It has helped to bring the faiths together—being interfaith in all its work. In the Atlanta Convention (1931), for example, for the first time it was discovered that Catholic, Jew, and Protestant have like philosophies of economics and industry.

It is this potent group that is meeting now, May 3, 4 and 5, in its 29th annual convention at Columbia University. This convention promises to be a significant factor in facing certain new issues confronting the moral and religious agencies of the continent.

The Wickersham report of recent history and later debate has been thought of as relating chiefly to the subject of prohibition. As a matter of fact only a small part deals with prohibition. The whole fourteen volumes present the greatest body of evidence ever assembled relating to the conditions and causes of crime and the effectiveness of our religious and educational agencies in building a responsible citizenship.

When the White House Conference adopted a set of resolutions touching the health and protection of American childhood and youth, called the Children's Charter, the President of the United States caused a copy to be sent to me. The first draught, which I had seen, had been somewhat revised, and in looking over the revision I looked first of all toward the end of the charter toward the provision relating to the moral and spiritual training of the child. I was greatly disappointed not to find it, but I glanced back over the opening paragraphs before putting it away and to my great joy found it had been put first. *"For every child spiritual and moral training to help him stand firm under the pressure of life."* I learned later that it was the President himself who had taken it from the fourteenth place and put it above all the others, where it belongs.

On Saturday last we celebrated the anniversary of the inauguration of Washington as the first President of the United States. In preparing to speak on that occasion I re-read his inaugural address and I was surprised to find how much of

that address was devoted to a recognition of Deity. Nothing could be more appropriate in inaugurating this convention than a repetition of a few of the sentences with which he began and ended his address.

After expressing his conflicting emotions in accepting the office, he began:

It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to his charge. . . No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency; and in the important revolution just accomplished in the system of their united government the tranquil deliberations and voluntary consent of so many distinct communities from which the event has resulted can not be compared with the means by which most govern-

ments have been established without some return of pious gratitude, along with an humble anticipation of the future blessings which the past seem to presage. These reflections, arising out of the present crisis, have forced themselves too strongly on my mind to be suppressed. You will join

with me, I trust, in thinking that there are none under the influence of which the proceedings of a new and free government can more auspiciously commence.

He added that the foundation of national policy must be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality. And he ended the address saying:

I shall take my present leave; but not without resorting once more to the benign Parent of the Human Race in humble supplication that, since He has been pleased to favor the American people with opportunities for deliberating in perfect tranquillity, and dispositions for deciding with unparalleled unanimity on a form of government for the security of their union and the advancement of their happiness, so His

Nothing is more evident today in the stress and strain of our economic depression than that our system of education has not been developing adequate character.

divine blessing may be equally *conspicuous* in the enlarged views, the temperate consultations, and the wise measures on which the success of this Government must depend.

In response to the address of the Senate, he made a brief reply, ending :

Thus supported by a firm trust in the Great Arbiter of the Universe, aided by the collected wisdom of the Union, and imploring the divine benediction on our joint exertions in the service of our country, I readily engage with you in the arduous but pleasing task of attempting to make a nation happy.

These views spoken in this city at the inception of our government under the Constitution have latest expression in words quoted by President Ruthven of the University of Michigan only last month :

As the integration of all thought and all actions true religion is the foundation of society, the basis on which all true civil government rests, and from which power derives its authority, laws their efficacy and both their sanction. If it is once shaken by contempt the whole fabric cannot be stable or lasting.

The subject of our conference is therefore of gravest national importance. It touches not only the life of every human being but the very existence of the social organization—the State, whose foundation is true religion.

The discussions of this convention are to go to the root of things in the hope that out of them may come some guid-

ance in the present groping toward the light of a new day for mankind—some clarifying of the issues involved for the character-developing agencies—the home, the church, the school.

Of course these questions set down for consideration can not be answered in a day. The Association, through the committees which have been working on these problems for months, has already laid plans to continue the studies in the form of permanent institutes. These institutes will continue, each with its specific problem, for a year or years, in order to make the results of their studies of practical value to the nation.

Nothing is more evident today in the stress and strain of our economic depression than that our system of education has not been developing adequate character. It appears with new force that the spiritual development of moral conscience is the priceless factor in any generation. It is the highest enterprise for us who are

but Man upon his way  
From God to God, summing the race that's been  
But giving glimpse of a diviner grace  
Than has evolved—but will for soul is bound  
To mould such body as it needs require  
To bear it toward the goal it seeks—  
Else why were clay uplifted to this height  
If it can never reach the higher height,  
The image it would make of God in man?





---

## A STATEMENT OF THE SITUATION

GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM

THE National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, appointed by President Hoover in May, 1929, to study and report on the problem of the enforcement of the prohibition and other laws, was charged by him to make an exhaustive study of the entire problem of the enforcement of our laws and the improvement of our judicial system.

The commission devoted two years of intensive labors to carrying out this mandate, calling to its assistance literally hundreds of qualified persons from all over the United States, and, at the end of June, 1931, it had rendered to the President fourteen reports, two of them on prohibition. Of the other twelve, five deal with the causes of crime, partly under that title and partly under the heads of "Lawless Methods of Law Enforcement"; "Enforcement of the Deportation Laws of the United States"; the "Child Offender in the Federal System of Justice," and "Crime and the Foreign Born." The machinery of justice and its defects are discussed and improvements recommended in reports on "Police," "Prosecution," "Criminal Procedure," and "Federal Courts." The post conviction treatment of offenders against the law is considered in a report

on "Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole." The first comprehensive, scientific study ever attempted in this country of the cost of crime and criminal justice in the United States is presented in a separate report. A study and report on criminal statistics was submitted as an essential introduction to the whole series of reports. These reports were transmitted by the President to Congress without comment. The overwhelming public interest in the prohibition problem is such that little or no attention has been given to these other reports, and it is therefore a matter of great satisfaction to me that the Religious Education Association should devote the program of this, its twenty-ninth annual convention, to a consideration of the causes of crime and lawlessness in the administration of law as shown in the reports of the commission, together with their implications for religious and character education.

\* \* \*

The problem of crime is not a novelty in any civilization. Departures from the moral standards which have prevailed in almost all times and countries occur whenever temptation meets with opportunity. The commands of the Mosaic

decalogue to refrain from murder, adultery, theft, lying, and covetousness strike at tendencies of human character as old as recorded history. The declaration that there is but one God, whose name should be respected; the prohibition of idolatry; the setting apart of one day in seven for rest and reflection; and the command that children should not merely *obey* but *honor* their parents completes a moral code sufficiently inclusive to embrace all the essentials of a healthy and crime-free life. Yet even these simple and easily understood precepts, which have been embodied in the penal laws of almost all modern states, including our own, are constantly disobeyed. What is the resulting volume of crime it is impossible to state with accuracy. Statistics in our country are notoriously inadequate and even misleading. We know more about crimes that are committed nowadays than ever before. The newspapers gather tales of lawless acts from all parts of the world and lay more or less sensational accounts of them upon every breakfast table. The radio repeats the details of the most striking crimes to millions of listening ears, and the "movies" dramatize crimes of passion or adventure to countless audiences in a manner which is far more apt to promote imitation than to awaken disgust. But owing to the lack of reliable statistics one cannot tell whether or not crime in this country is increasing out of proportion to the growth of our population, or what form of crime is growing in volume. But that much crime exists—too much indeed, and that some of the boldest and most brutal offenses are committed by very young men and women, is demonstrated by daily occurrences. The reports of the National Commission deal at great length with the machinery of prosecution and punishment. Much reliance is placed and always has been put upon punishment as a deterrent from crime. Yet when penalties were most severe, crimes against life and property

were most prevalent. Is there not something better than fines, imprisonment and killing to cause men to refrain from law breaking? This question leads us to consider the causes of crime. Are they sufficiently ascertainable that methods of prevention may be developed which shall be more effective than punishment? Writers on this subject have pointed out that different conceptions of public interest result in different penal provisions for the same act, and that even where different states or countries agree that a certain act carries with it harmful social consequences, they do not always agree that the criminal law is the best instrument for eradicating the resulting evil. There is a body of opinion to the effect that much of our criminal law embodies only the will of organized minorities and does not reflect a general moral sentiment. Granting the right of organized society to prohibit by law any act which its legislative power determines to be contrary to the public interest, different countries employ varied methods to induce observance of legal mandates. Raymond B. Fosdick says:

We are, of all people, not excepting the Germans, preeminently addicted to the habit of standardizing by law, the lives and morals of our citizens. . . . We like to pass laws compelling the individual to do what we think he ought to do for his own good.

In other countries, he says, it is not enough that laws relating to public morality shall have the support of *some* elements in the community. They must have the substantial support of the *entire* community.

Yet all civilized countries punish murder, robbery, burglary, theft, and false swearing as serious crimes, and, broadly speaking, in every country the public sentiment of the entire community supports the laws which impose serious penalties for these offenses.

Breaches of laws such as these appear to be those most frequently committed in the United States at the present time.

The crimes which fill our prisons very largely are the old familiar ones, which have been punished with forfeiture, imprisonment, or death since the days of Moses. So the problem is narrowed down to the inquiry why men kill, rob, steal, and commit like offenses. The soundest approach to the problem of the causation of crime, according to some of the commission's experts, lies through the study of the individual criminal in relation to all the social and environmental factors which have an influence on his personality. Healy says "Practically all confirmed criminals begin their careers in childhood and early youth." Burt agrees, saying, ". . . It is in childhood that most criminals commence their lawless careers. The majority of habitual offenders receive their first conviction before they are 21."

Similar statements are made in the reports of the New York Crime Commission, the Illinois Survey, and the Missouri Survey.

Dr. and Mrs. Sheldon Gluck, in their study of 500 criminal careers, found that 92.5 per cent of the criminals studied, of whom about 80 per cent later committed additional offenses, committed their first delinquency before the age of 18.

Mr. Bettman, in his analysis of state surveys and other reports embraced in the commission's report on prosecution, says:

The juvenile offender is the heart of the problem and the instrumentalities devised by society for dealing with him the most important.

The New York Crime Commission, in the introductory chapter of its 1928 report, refers to intensive studies of the life histories of 145 inmates of the state's penal institutions, saying:

The studies also showed that delinquency begins in childhood, increases during adolescence, continues mounting, and reaches its peak during the vigorous and adventurous years of young manhood. Statistics from all

parts of the country show that this is uniformly characteristic and again, that

The majority of those men committed to the state prisons and to the state reformatory began their delinquent careers as children. They presented behavior problems in school and later became truants.

Mr. Bettman, reviewing the conclusions in these surveys, says:

But neither any limitation as to the definition of administration of criminal justice, nor the greater dramatic appeal of adult crime, of jury trials and forensic eloquence, should be permitted to divert emphasis from the place where it must be located, if it is to be located intelligently. The people of the country should be made aware of how little, relatively, the perfecting of the machinery and methods of dealing with the adult criminals will accomplish toward crime prevention, if we neglect the creation of forces, agencies, and methods which attack crime at its source in the personalities and environment of the young. (Report No. 4, p. 82.)

... the method of administering justice is often more important than justice itself.

Reviewing the history of 1051 men admitted to Sing Sing in the twelve months ending February 28, 1930, Miss Mary Van Kleeck

comments on the large proportion of young men in Sing Sing, and says the figures seem to show

That society has the problem of so relating young men to the legitimate means of earning a livelihood that they will refrain from law-breaking. (Report No. 13, p. 211.)

And Warden Lawes, in his autobiography entitled *Twenty Thousand Years in Sing Sing*, says:

In the last analysis if there be any permanent diminution of crime, we shall have to look to our adolescents.

\* \* \*

How have we dealt with the problem of bringing up our children in respect for the law? A candid answer to this question is a serious reflection upon our civilization and our institutions of government.

The commission submits with its report a study made by Professor Ploscowe of the influence of the family, the community, the gang, and the juvenile

institution, either from the view of their failure to impart socially acceptable behavior patterns, or their positively demoralizing effect in the creation of anti-social behavior. He points to the professional criminal as the final result of a long series of demoralizing social influences. Whatever the shortcomings of the family, he says,

The community too frequently acts itself as an agency of demoralization. . . . There seems to be no escaping the conclusion that the family is fundamental: It is the state's first bulwark against the formation of anti-social tendencies. At present it seems that in the very places where the family inadequacy is apt to be greatest, instead of offsetting the results, the community makes them worse. If nothing intervenes between the children and adult demoralizing influences, a point of direct contact is provided by the gang, the children's play group. Finally, the evidence as to the failure of institutional treatment points in some cases to a direct subversion of its aims.

These conclusions are fortified by a study of the community, the family, and the gang in relation to delinquent behavior, made for the commission by Dr. Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay, of Chicago, which forms the second volume of the commission's report on causes of crime.

An understanding of the behavior of the child [they say] necessitates a knowledge of the social world in which he lives. Children always live and act in association with other persons. They live as members of groups, as participants, in the activities of a dynamic social world: It is artificial to view them and their behavior apart from the various social groups of which they are members.

These gentlemen made a study of the conditions in the slum areas in Chicago and six or seven other cities, in all of which they found like conditions. In these neighborhoods the child's most vital and intimate social contacts are often limited to the spontaneous and undirected neighborhood play groups and gangs. The population in these areas usually is composed of the latest immigrant races. Their children break away from the traditional restraints of their parents, form undesirable acquaintances at school, become truants, are

initiated into petty criminal acts, are arrested and sent to reformatories, where they meet older boys who are advanced in criminal conduct and thence proceed in steady gradation in and out of reformatories, advancing in gangs and finally becoming professional criminals and landing in state's prison. The reports of case studies of a considerable number of boys who grew up in these areas are a sad commentary of the part played by reformatories in dealing with juvenile offenders. They exhibit these institutions as training places in crime. No boy who served a term, however short, in one of them seems to have been benefited by it. In general the little boys were thrown with older offenders and learned to look up to them with admiration and to develop a determination to follow their example. The study made by Dr. and Mrs. Sheldon Gluck into the careers of five hundred graduates of the Massachusetts Reformatory, considered the best in the country, during the years 1911-22, established the fact, as stated by Dr. Richard C. Cabot, in his introduction, that

Eighty per cent were not reformed five to ten years later but went right on committing crimes after their discharge.

This is a damning piece of evidence [says Doctor Cabot] not against that reformatory in particular which probably stands high among institutions of its kind, but against the reformatory system in general. Here it does not work. No one knows that it works any better elsewhere.

Warden Lawes tells us in his latest book that

The records of Sing Sing show that ninety-seven per cent of our prisoners were never associated with any boys' club or any of the juvenile associations where boys learn how to spend their leisure in wholesome recreation.

Educators and social workers know [he says], that juvenile delinquency gives way before supervised playgrounds and well-organized boys' and kindred organizations. Some of our larger centres of population report that wherever new playgrounds are opened, juvenile delinquency in that neighborhood drops perceptibly. And yet reliable authority has it that three out of every five children in our greatest cities are without adequate opportunity for wholesome play.

Every one should read this book, in which Warden Lawes tells the story of his twelve years' work at Sing Sing prison. There is in it more reliable information about crime and criminals and the factors which operate to produce the young offenders which constitute so large a part of our prison populations, than can be found in any official report of which I have knowledge.

So long as we tolerate in our large cities slum areas of the kinds described in the commission's report and allow children to grow up in them, with no healthy outlet for their natural spirits—no playgrounds, no boys' clubs open to all:—so long as our jails remain what they are, places where young and old, the criminal and the innocent, are herded together in conditions that violate every principle of decency: so long as in reformatories the delinquent boy or girl is brought in contact with the seasoned offender, and given every opportunity to learn the lure of adventurous crime: so long as release of children on probation is a pretense and furnishes no intelligent sympathetic guidance to a useful career,—just so long will the ranks of the criminals be steadily recruited by children.

Our practice of sending children to juvenile institutions where experience guides inexperience in the ways of vice and filth [says Mr. Lawes], is one of the tragedies of our national life. Of 1393 new admissions to Sing Sing during 1931, 343 are graduates of juvenile homes and reformatories. Compare these figures with the records of 3307 dependent children in New York City who were given individual treatment, all of whom were under sixteen years of age. They remained in private homes for periods ranging between one and five years between January 1, 1900, and January 1, 1910. Of these, only eleven were arrested for serious offenses.

This brings us to a consideration of the creation and development of the juvenile court, in the United States, which has been made possible by drawing a line between the child and adults by state law. As the commission states in its Report No. 6,

The child offender is generally dealt with on a non-criminal basis and has been pro-

tected from prosecution and conviction for crime. The state has come to regard him as its ward. It has assumed guardianship over him. It has undertaken to safeguard, train and educate, rather than to punish him. It has substituted social for penal methods; the concept of juvenile delinquency for that of crime.

This system was first established in the juvenile court in Boston, Massachusetts. From there it has spread through most of the states of the Union. The commission in its report presents facts showing the lack of such a distinction in the federal jurisdiction and recommends congressional legislation which shall permit its application by the Federal courts. In the meantime, the United States Department of Justice is working out a method whereby a juvenile apprehended for violation of a federal law may be turned over to the state authorities to be dealt with, not as a criminal, but as a wayward boy.

Most, if not all, modern students of crime, agree that the best method of preventing crime lies in surrounding children with healthy and harmless outlets for their natural spirits, and in inspiring them with good principles and useful ambition. Warden Lawes says that he knows that 50 per cent of his wards are not criminally minded. That half as many more are the products of circumstance and environment. That of the remaining 25 per cent only a possible half are aggressively anti-social and dangerous to the community.

\* \* \*

Whatever the offenses of the individual toward society, the crimes of organized society toward the individual are infinitely greater. Read besides the commission's reports on the causes of crime, those on lawlessness in law enforcement, on crime and the foreign born, and on the enforcement of the deportation laws of the United States. Read the reports on prosecution and on criminal procedure and you will realize how often the machinery set up to enforce law or to prevent crime becomes the most potent

engine for creating criminals. Read the report on penal institutions, probation and parole, for the sad history of the way a chance offender is made into a lifelong enemy of society through the influence of local lockups and jails. Dr. Hastings Hart, chairman of the commission's advisory committee, in his report on this subject makes the following statement:

Our study reveals that throughout the United States, the majority of the 11,000 police jails and lockups are literally a public nuisance and are unfit for the purposes for which they are designed. . . . Thousands of police jails and lockups are fire traps. . . . Many . . . are antiquated buildings unfit for the purpose. . . . Very few lockups make proper provision for the segregation and classification of women, witnesses and young people. It is common for young and inexperienced prisoners and even children to be thrown into intimate association for days at a time with vicious, depraved and diseased criminals.

To discuss the nature and condition of most state prisons and penitentiaries, where persons convicted of serious offenses are confined, would require more time and space than is permissible on this occasion. The essential facts are presented in the above mentioned report. The release of prisoners on probation, or on parole, where accompanied by adequate and proper supervision, has been demonstrated to be far more effective in checking criminal conduct than any other method. As Warden Lawes says:

We should encourage and sustain the efforts of all agencies that have to do with detection, correction and supervision and extend a willing and helping hand to the boy or man seriously determined to come back. Therein lies the way.

This is the nub of the matter. Many men who are far from being criminals at heart commit crime under temptation which comes to them at a moment when their resisting powers are weak. It may be a moment of passion: It may be the need of money. But it is a moment of temptation which overcomes principle. The punishment ascribed by law to the crime may have little relation to the actual offense. The problem for society is to prevent such men from developing into the outlaw class and becoming lifelong burdens upon society.

\* \* \*

Two essentials seem to lie at the root of the problem: First, to surround the growing child with healthy influences and develop in him good principles, and secondly, to help the first offender with sympathy and aid which may enable him to redeem himself and to go straight.

Lastly, we should remember that men will respect law only when law is respectable and that the method of administering justice is often more important than justice itself.

\* \* \*



## THE MORAL LIFE IN PERSPECTIVE

J. V. MOLDENHAWER

MY ASSIGNMENT for this evening is to try to suggest the presumable value of the ideas which underlie our moral conduct, religiously speaking, in terms of a discovery of the way in which, in the actual course of events, religion has been competent to deal with what we call social behavior.

What I thought of immediately in connection with my assignment was the title of a chapter in a book, written some twenty years or so ago, by Henry Osborn Taylor, called *The Medieval Mind*. In this book, after describing medieval ideas and showing much about the way the medieval mind longed for goodness and beauty, he wrote this chapter which he called "The Spotted Actuality," and ever since I first read that tremendous epithet it has remained in my mind as the most adequate description of the life we know as it is.

We are always living in the midst of the spotted actuality, yet there is for me a fundamental sophistry in the customary modernistic criticism of our "individualistic religion," as if this were to blame for the spotted actuality. The shortcomings of the popular dogma that originally religion and ethics are things apart is to me quite obvious. Attention has been drawn to that already by the preceding

speaker and I think I need only suggest two or three sentences on that same idea.

Let us remember, then, that both Judaism and Christianity have been from the beginning profoundly ethical. The age-old ethical problems involved the eternally complex relations between persons, affecting, according to the knowledge and imagination of a given time, its visible areas of politics, economics, industry, and the home, whatever the words may have been by which these relationships were described. If we want an illustration in the field of the perfectly familiar, I think I may put it this way, and quite briefly. If we consider the biblical story of the Sons of Eli, the story of the shepherds of Israel who fed themselves, in the book of Ezekiel, we see that the denunciations are of precisely the same character as the denunciation of the wicked leaders of religion in Piers Plowman, and the passage about the Friar in the Canterbury Tales. The heaviest accusations against these men concern their selfishness and rapacity, as the ideal is that of compassion and unselfish service. The crux of the denunciation lay in the invocation of the wrath of God against all villainy, and the declaration of the tender love of God for all manner of

poor and oppressed people. And the perverse assumption that religion can be pure in spite of indifference to social ethics is never made. On the contrary, it is dismissed with a bottomless intensity of fervor and an inexhaustible richness of vocabulary.

The one thing that our religion (and when I say our religion I mean Christianity and Judaism) characteristically is, above all else, is a conviction with respect to the radical and essential meaning to man's life of his experience as a being owing obligation to the God who made him and to his fellow creatures. And only the most radical heretics ever tried to deny this or to drag the two apart. If I were asked where our Western world got its most vivid sense of what we call, with a touch of pedantry, our notions of what is "social" and what "anti-social," I should unhesitatingly reply, "Out of its religious tradition, Hebrew and Christian."

It is even arguable that the scorned religious institution, in ancient Jewry and in medieval Catholicism, was the entity which was insistent in preserving a dominant sense of social actuality and social obligation, and that in the teeth of constant rebelliousness of over-individualistic persons bent merely upon having their own way and seeking their own profit. That would not be the whole truth, but it would be much nearer the truth than the statement that the religious institution, with its religious observance and worship of God was constantly beguiling men's minds away from the consideration of the ethical affairs of the actual world. And that is what we are always having to listen to.



Now let us turn to the time just past—say the last two or three centuries. Here I can bring you some pertinent illustra-

tions of the way in which religious sanction has affected the question of morality—social and unsocial conduct. The citations may be called, if you will, rather literary than historical. These are my witnesses. First, a courtly Anglican priest of the Seventeenth Century; second, an American Quaker, of the Eighteenth Century; third, a Parliamentary report, of the Nineteenth Century; and finally, a famous English novelist, of the

Nineteenth Century, but about fifteen or twenty years later than the date of the Parliamentary report. I think it ought to be clear to anyone that I could have piled the evidence as high as the Empire State Build-

ing, if I had had the time and inclination, and depended on the possibility of talking without any limit. If I have selected these few illustrations, it is chiefly because of reasons which I shall be able to indicate as I read them to you, and follow them with what I trust will be a reasonably brief comment.

The first quotation, then, is from the Anglican priest of the Seventeenth Century. After I finish the citation I will tell you more about it.

Obedience to human laws must be for conscience' sake: that is, because in such obedience public order, and charity, and benefit, is concerned, and because the law of God commands us: therefore we must make a conscience in keeping the just laws of superiors: and although the matter before the making of the law was indifferent, yet now the obedience is not indifferent; but next to the laws of God we are to obey the laws of all our superiors, who the more public they are, the first they are to be in the order of obedience.

Human laws are not to be broken with scandal, nor at all without reason; for he that does it causelessly is a despiser of the law, and undervalues the authority. For human laws differ from divine laws principally in this: first that the positive commands of a man may be broken upon smaller and more reasons than the positive commands of God; we may upon a smaller reason omit to keep any of the fasting-days of the church, than omit to give alms to the poor: only this, the reason must bear weight

If I were asked where our Western world got its most vivid sense of what . . . is "social" and what "anti-social," I should unhesitatingly reply, "Out of its religious tradition, Hebrew and Christian."

according to the gravity and concernment of the law;

We must not be too busy in examining the prudence and unreasonableness of human laws; for although we are not bound to believe them all to be the wisest, yet if by enquiring into the lawfulness of them, or by any other instrument, we find them to fail of that wisdom with which some others are ordained, yet we must never make use of it to disparage the person of the lawgiver, or to countenance any man's disobedience, much less our own.

Let no prices be heightened by the necessity or unskillfulness of the contractor: for the first is direct uncharitableness to the person, and injustice in the thing, because the man's necessity could not naturally enter into the consideration of the value of the commodity; and the other is deceit and oppression: much less must any man make necessities, as by engrossing a commodity, by monopoly, by detaining corn, or the like indirect arts; for such persons are unjust to all single persons with whom in such cases they contract, and oppressors of the public.

In intercourse with others, do not do all which you may lawfully do, but keep something within thy power: and because there is a latitude of gain in buying and selling, take not thou the utmost penny that is lawful, or which thou thinkest so; for although it be lawful, yet it is not safe; and he that gains all that he can gain lawfully this year, possibly next year will be tempted to gain something unlawfully.

He that sells dearer by reason he sells not for ready money, must increase his price no higher than to make himself recompense for the loss which according to the rules of trade he sustained by his forbearance, according to common computation; reckoning in also the hazard, which he is prudently, warily, and charitably, to estimate. But although this be the measure of his justice, yet because it happens either to their friends, or to necessitous and poor persons, they are in these cases to consider the rules of friendship and neighborhood, and the obligations of charity, lest justice turn into unmercifulness.

Let no man for his own poverty become more oppressing and cruel in his bargain, but quietly, modestly, diligently, and patiently, recommend his estate to God, and follow its interest, and leave the success to Him: for such courses will more probably advance his trade; they will certainly procure him a blessing and a recompense, and if they cure not his poverty, they will take away the evil of it; and there is nothing else in it that can trouble him.

Religiously keep all promises and covenants though made to your disadvantage, though afterwards you perceive you might have been better; and let not any precedent act of yours be altered by any after accident. Let nothing make you break your promise, unless it be unlawful, or impossible; that is, either out of your natural, or out of your civil power, yourself being under the power of another; or that it be intolerably inconvenient to yourself, and of no advantage to another; or that you have leave expressed, or reasonably presumed.

Let no man take wages or fees for a work

that he cannot do, or cannot with probability undertake, or in some sense profitably and with ease or with advantage manage.

Let no man appropriate to his own use what God by a special mercy, or the republic, hath made common; for that is both against justice and charity too.

Notice the facts. First, the character type of the writer. He is a singularly religious man whose primary interest is what we might call pure religion. The book out of which I quoted is entitled *Holy Living* and is known as one of the great devotional books in the English language. The relatively new nature of the situation is to be observed in a community not quite used to what we describe as the capitalistic system. Note also the essentially open-minded, imaginative way in which Jeremy Taylor applies his Christian principles, his religious sanctions to the difficult and troublesome questions of which he is aware. And note the vivid warmth that his deeply religious feeling and thought lends to the conscientiousness of his consideration.

The next citation is from the Eighteenth Century Quaker. He is telling about his voyage across the Atlantic Ocean.

As my lodging in the Stearage, now near a week, hath afforded me sundry opportunities of seeing, hearing and feeling, with respect to the life and Spirit of many poor Sailors, an inward exercise of Soul hath attended me, in regard to placing our Children and youth where they may be likely to be exampled and instructed in pure fear of the Lord; and I being much amongst the Sea men, have from a motion of love, sundry times taken opportunities with one alone, and in a free conversation, laboured to turn their heads toward the fear of the Lord and this day we had a meeting in the Cabin where my heart was contrite under a feeling of divine Love.

Now concerning Lads being trained up as Seamen, I believe a communication from one part of the world to some other parts of it, by sea, is at times consistent with the will of our Heavenly Father; and to Educate some youth in the practice of Sailing, I believe may be right; but how lamentable is the present corruption of the world! How impure are the Channels through which trade hath a Conveyance! How great is that danger to which poor lads are now exposed, when placed on Shipboard to learn the Art of sailing!

Five lads, training up for the Seas, were now on board this Ship, two of them brought up amongst our Society, one of which hath a right amongst friends, by name James Nailor, to

whose father James Nailor mentioned in Sewell's History, appears to have been uncle. I often feel a tenderness of heart toward these poor lads, and at times, look at them as though they were my Children according to the flesh.

O that all may take heed and beware of Covetousness! O that all may learn of Christ who is meek and low of Heart! Then in faithfully following him, he will teach us to be content with food and raiment, without respect to the customs of honours of this world. Men thus redeemed will feel a tender concern for their fellow creatures, and a desire that those in the lowest stations may be assisted and encouraged. And where owners of Ships attain to the perfect Law of Liberty, and are doers of the word these will be blessed in their deeds.

The book is the *Journal of John Woolman*, which has among other distinctions that of being included in the famous five-foot book shelf. His central interest is ethical religion. He is quite incapable of believing that religion has any more native or important function than that of fostering right living, especially right relations between human beings. And he is no less incapable of believing that the religious sanction, the sense of moving under the impulse of a just and good God, could possibly be less than the Supreme Sanction.

His chief interest has been, up to this time, slavery in America, but his mind, an alert, religious mind, resists the insinuating temptations to be a moral crusader and keeps him quick to mark every crisis, to meet every situation in which are the elements of the old trouble. And no one can read the *Journal* without noting that the prime reality is his sense of the ever compelling righteous will of God.

The next citation is from a Parliamentary report. This is the report of Sadler's Committee in about the second quarter of the Nineteenth Century.

The Report of Sadler's Committee is a classical document; it is one of the main sources of our knowledge of the conditions of factory life at the time. Its pages bring before the reader in the vivid form of dialogue the kind of life that was led by the victims of the new system. Men and women who were old at twenty, from all the industrial districts, from Manchester, from Glasgow, from Huddersfield, from Dundee, from Bradford, from Leeds, passed before their rulers with their tale of weariness, misery, and diseased and twisted limbs. A worsted spinner of Huddersfield, Joseph Hebergam,

aged seventeen, described his day's work at the age of seven. His hours were from five in the morning to eight at night, with one solitary break of thirty minutes at noon. All other meals had to be taken in snatches, without any interruption of work. "Did you not become very drowsy and sleepy towards the end of the day and feel much fatigued?" "Yes; that began about three o'clock; and grew worse and worse, and it came to be very bad towards six and seven." "What means were taken to keep you at your work so long?" "There were three overlookers; there was one a head overseer, and there was one man kept to grease the machines, and there was one kept on purpose to strap." His brother, who worked in the same mill, died at sixteen from spinal affection, due to his work, and he himself began to grow deformed after six months of it. "How far do you live from the mill?" "A good mile." "Was it very painful for you to move?" "Yes, in the morning I could scarcely walk, and my brother and sister used, out of kindness, to take me under each arm, and run with me to the mill, and my legs dragged on the ground; in consequence of the pain I could not walk." Another witness, an overseer in a flax spinning mill at Dundee, said that there were nine workers in the room under his charge who had begun work before they were nine years old, and that six of them were splay-footed and the other three deformed in other ways. A tailor at Stanningley, Samuel Coulson, who had three daughters in the mill, described the life of his household when the mill was busy. In the ordinary time the hours were from six in the morning to half-past eight at night; in the brisk time, for six weeks in the year, these girls, the youngest of them "going eight," worked from three in the morning to ten or half-past ten at night. "What was the length of time they could be in bed during those long hours?" "It was near eleven o'clock before we could get them into bed after getting a little victuals, and then at morning my mistress used to stop up all night, for fear that we could not get them ready for the time; sometimes we have gone to bed and one of us generally awoke." "Were the children excessively fatigued by this labour?" "Many times; we have cried often when we have given them the little victuals we had to give them; we had to shake them, and they have fallen asleep with the victuals in their mouths many a time."

Another witness, Gillett Sharpe, described how his boy, who had been very active and a good runner, gradually lost the use of his limbs at the mill. "I had three steps up into my house and I have seen that boy get hold of the sides of the door to assist his getting up into the house; many a one advised me to take him away; they said he would be ruined and made quite a cripple; but I was a poor man, and could not afford to take him away, having a large family, six children under my care."

From the Report of the Commission of 1840-1842:

In every district except North Staffordshire, where the younger children were needed in the

Potteries, the employment of children of seven was common, in many pits children were employed at six, in some at five, and in one case a child of three was found to be employed. Even babies were sometimes taken down into the pits to keep the rats from their fathers' food. The youngest children were employed as trappers; that is, they were in charge of the doors in the galleries, on the opening and closing of which the safety of the mine depended. For the ventilation of the mine was contrived on a simple principle; there were two shafts, one the downcast, the other the upcast. A fire was lighted at the foot of the upcast to drive the air up the shaft, and air was sucked down through the downcast to fill the vacuum. This air was conducted by means of a series of doors through all the workings of the mine on its passage to the upcast, and these doors were in the charge of a little boy or girl, who sat in a small hole, with a string in his or her hand, in darkness and solitude for twelve hours or longer at a time. "Although this employment," reported the Commission, "scarcely deserves the name of labour, yet as the children engaged in it are commonly excluded from light, and are always without companions, it would, were it not for the passing and re-passing of the coal carriages, amount to solitary confinement of the worst order."

Children were also employed to push the small carriages filled with coals along the passages, and as the passages were often very low and narrow, it was necessary to use very small children for this purpose. "In many mines which are at present worked, the main gates are only from 24 to 30 inches high, and in some parts of these mines the passages do not exceed 18 inches in height. In this case not only is the employment of very young children absolutely indispensable to the working of the mine, but even the youngest children must necessarily work in a bent position of the body." As a rule the carriages were pushed along small iron railways, but sometimes they were drawn by children and women, "harnessed like dogs in a go-cart," and moving, like dogs, on all fours. Another children's task was that of pumping water in the underbottom of pits, a task that kept children standing ankle-deep in water for twelve hours. In certain districts children were used for a particularly responsible duty. In Derbyshire and parts of Lancashire and Cheshire it was the custom to employ them as engine men, to let down and draw up the cages in which the population of the pit descended to its depths and returned to the upper air. A "man of discretion" required 30s. a week wages; these substitutes only cost 5s. or 7s. a week. Accidents were, of course, frequent,—on one occasion three lives were lost because a child engineman of nine turned away to look at a mouse at a critical moment,—and the Chief Constable of Oldham said that the coroners declined to bring in verdicts of gross neglect from pity for the children.

The citation is from Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's volume, *Charles Dickens and Other Victorians*, in the chapter called,

"The Victorian Background." The situation, in all its horror, is new. Be sure to get this—the *situation is new*. It had emerged before men realized how bad it was, or how callous men could be made by the terrific competition of the new machine age.

Note again, the spirit is that of vivid humanitarianism, eloquent—terribly so, almost in spite of itself—for we are reading a Parliamentary Report. The energy given it is furnished by the religious earnestness of those behind the reform movement—chiefly two men—Michael Sadler and the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury. And if you want to know what the so-called motivation (a word I hate like poison) is, in the mind of that very great man, Lord Shaftesbury, all you have to do is to read the article in the encyclopaedia and you find him to have been a notably religious man, and it is his religion that drives him with unflagging zeal along the path.

They, being sensitive minds, are not for a moment in doubt that the old sanctions have to do with the new "situation." In fact it is plain to see that both these men find it perfectly intolerable to pretend to be religious without caring for these things.

The last citation is from a novel. I hope there are many of my unintellectual or intellectual friends who still love Charles Dickens. Anyway, it is one of his pathetic passages. There are some that I can't bear, but in spite of its rhetorical character, this seems to retain a beautiful persuasiveness to all the native and decently tender instincts of men.

You picture this poor wastrel of the streets, on his death bed, with his friend, a man of another circle, and a higher circle of life, by his side.

"It's turned very dark, sir. Is there any light a-comin'?"

"It is coming fast, Jo."

"Fast. The cart is shaken all to pieces, and the rugged road is very near its end."

"Jo, my poor fellow!"

"I hear you, sir, in the dark, but I'm a gropin'—a gropin'—let me catch hold of your hand."

"Jo, can you say what I say?"

"I'll say anything as you say, sir, for I knows it's good."

"Our Father."

"Our Father!—yes, that's very good, sir."

"Which art in Heaven?"

"Art in Heaven—is the light a-comin', sir?"

"It is close at hand. Hallowed be thy name!"

"Hallowed be—thy—"

The light is come upon the dark benighted way. Dead!

Dead, your Majesty. Dead, my lords and gentlemen. Dead, Right Reverends, and Wrong Reverends of every order. Dead, men and women, born with Heavenly compassion in your hearts. And dying thus around us every day.

The book is *Bleak House*. Now, remember the writer is Charles Dickens, a man not at all noted for his attachment to Ecclesiastical Christianity. But the voice is the voice of religion in the great mood common to Judaism and Christianity. And it does not doubt that what has to deal with Jo and his kind is "heavenly compassion." The religious sanction is quite alive, and morally alert, and morally competent.

If I am told after this that of course the working of the religious sanction is very slow, I shall not ever argue. I admit it. That is characteristic of any process, in these our human affairs. But to point out the tardiness and procrastination of religious men is not to demonstrate the incompetence of the religious sanction.

If the question is whether we might not relegate God or God's will to the background, I can only say that this is a queer suggestion to come from teachers of religion. Our faith is our passion, and the passionate faith of those who see right conduct in terms of the will of God is this: that everything in our aspirations (if that word has not also been excluded from the fashionable vocabulary) is fortified, dignified, and energized by the conviction that God is with us to comfort,

direct, and sustain us when we seek the good, to restrain, rebuke, and punish when we try to be content with evil.

I am going to close with a favorite story of mine. It appeared in *The Outlook*, years and years ago—it may even have been in the days when *The Outlook* was *The Christian Union*—before it unhappily changed its mind as to the propriety of that as a name for a weekly periodical. It is a story that I especially like because it was translated from the Danish, which is one of my native tongues.

It is about a spider. The little spider is said to have come out one morning, a bright, beautiful morning, to run about his web and take account of its condition. He found little gems of dewdrops with the sunshine sparkling on them. He ran about apparently testing the delicate contrivance to see if all were well.

All seems indeed to be well until suddenly he finds himself darting swiftly up a strand that goes straight up into the air. He runs up a distance. He cannot find where it is fastened, and he runs down puzzled, because he is a tidy-minded little spider and he likes to know where everything belongs. Again he runs up, this time a little farther. Still he is clearly not at the end of it, and again he runs back. Then his sense of decency and order and all things shipshape seizes upon him and he says, "That thing isn't serving any use. Where did it come from?"—quite forgetting that once upon a time that was the strand by which he came down. And so, in an outburst of efficient range, he bites the strand in two, and his whole charming and effective little house collapses.



---

## A THEISTIC BASIS OF MORALITY

JAMES M. GILLIS

THE underlying assumption of these discussions, if I understand the purpose of the convention, is that we have reached a crisis in morals. I say a crisis, not a defeat, still less a rout, but we have indeed come to a crisis so acute that I can imagine our critics demanding to know why we hold philosophical discussion upon these fundamentals of ethics rather than go forth and preach a crusade.

I could understand it if some one should say, What we need at the present juncture is not a philosopher, but a preacher, a prophet; not a Socrates, endlessly discussing but never coming to a conclusion; not a Socrates, but an Isaiah, who should go forth into the world and say, "Hear, O Israel, thus sayeth the Lord!" or a Peter the hermit, to go up and down and aroundabout the world crying out, "God wills it," starting a moral crusade. For what can be the purpose of philosophical discussion in a crisis? Are we guilty of the same crime as that of Nero, fiddling while Rome burns? Which is worse, to fiddle while Rome burns, or to debate while Rome burns? When the Gauls assaulted the walls of Rome and broke through, they found the ultra-dignified Senate in

session. The startled senators rose from their seats as the barbarians came tearing into the Senate Chamber. One might say that those dignified fathers of the country might better have been out upon the ramparts instead of sitting there discussing when Rome was about to fall.

Are we playing with words and thoughts and arguments and conventions, are we washing the windows of the house while an earthquake is rocking the town, rearranging the furniture while the house is burning? Should we be out fighting rather than in here deliberating?

One of our difficulties seems to be that in contemporary society we don't know under just which banner to fight. If we were to go out to fight we might just be waving our arms wildly in the air. What we want is a plan of campaign. What we want is someone to teach us strategy for that campaign. We shall indeed go out and fight, presently, in the interests of the morality which will save civilization, if civilization is to be saved. But it may not be too late even yet to discuss tactics, ways, and means, and to look into the causes of the present moral crisis. Knowing

the causes perhaps we can apply the remedy.

That being the case, I find a keynote of this convention in the program which you hold in your hands. Therein I find this sentence:

"The series of problems with which this seminar is to deal" (and I dare say that I may substitute for the word "seminar," "this present meeting and the entire convention") has been set by the common substitution of the terms 'social' and 'anti-social' for the terms 'good' and 'bad' or 'right' and 'wrong.' Furthermore, "This term 'social' and 'anti-social,'" says the program, "may be used in either of two senses: first, in the psychological sense, referring to social approval or disapproval as the ultimate factors operative in morality": "second, in the more objective sense, referring to actual consequences of behavior in society." And the question is, "Must moral and religious education recognize to a greater extent than it usually does that conduct is criticized and guided by habit and custom rather than by jails and principles?"

Now, it is quite obvious, from that statement, that we are to discuss those things which are useful to society, or not useful to society, and that we are to consider as good that which is useful, and as bad, that which is not useful; as right, the things that are advantageous to society, as wrong, the things that are harmful to society.

The identification of the good with the useful is a fundamental principle in the philosophy of Jeremy Bentham, James Mill, John Stuart Mill, and, with some modifications consequent upon the evolutionary theory, Herbert Spencer. But it seems to me that utilitarianism is already passé. To all intents and purposes it is antiquated, and all but obsolete.

Even such a conservative scholar and thinker as Gilbert Murray, professor of Greek at Oxford, in an article in *Harper's Magazine*, about two and a

half years ago, said the most troublesome question that the cynic can propose to the moralists is this: "Granting that it is useful to society that I should be honest, why should I mind about society if I find it to my personal advantage to be dishonest?"

Gilbert Murray, as I say, is a conservative; he calls himself "an unmitigated high-brow." He has none of the earmarks of the fanatic or the immoralist; he is no anarchist, rebel, or communist, but he asks, "Why should I bother about society?" In saying that he has put his finger upon the weakness of the utilitarian philosophy. What does your law-breaker, high or low, care for society? The usefulness of an action to society he does not consider. Yet, if you are going to reconstruct the moral world, you must have some standard, some norm of good and bad, and above all a sanction for morals that will apply to these modern immoralists who care nothing about society.

It is a commonplace, for example, that the gangster, the racketeer, the kidnapper and, in general, the criminal of the lower social grades snaps his fingers in the face of society. He makes it a virtue to flaunt society. As a matter of fact, he has some reason. Underlying the idea that the good is that which is useful for society there is Rousseau's idea of a social contract, by which a man surrenders certain rights and liberties to the social body in return for certain protection and guidance that society shall give to him. But the gangster says, "What did society ever do for me? Society had me brought into the world in the depths of a slum; out of the slum I was graduated into jail; out of jail back to the streets again. What did society ever do to make a man of me?" "I am what you made me," says the criminal. "I recognize no obligations to society. I may be ignorant but I know something about contracts, and I know that no contract is valid unless it be bilateral. A one-sided contract is invalid. Why

should I recognize obligations to society," says the criminal, "if society does nothing for me?"

Of course, that is a criminal's argument and naturally an exaggeration. But Mr. Wickersham said in this very convention last night, "Whatever the offenses of the individual toward society, the crimes of organized society toward the individual are infinitely greater."

It seems to me that Mr. Wickersham has put the case even more strongly than the racketeer. "Infinitely greater" are the crimes of organized society toward the individual!

Again he said, last night, "Much of our criminal law embodies only the will of organized minorities and does not reflect a general moral sentiment." And yet further, "Often the machinery set up to enforce law or to prevent crime becomes the most potent engine for creating criminals. Read the report on penal in-

stitutions, probation, and parole, with the sad history of the way a chance offender" (and he repeats that in a very great many of his utterances that there is many a criminal who never started out to be a criminal, but is just a chance offender) "is made into a life-long enemy of society through the influence of local lockups and jails."

In other words, unless there be a complete revolution in society that will cause men and women universally to recognize their obligations and their duties toward the criminal, the idea of society imposing obligations and presenting its will and its own good as the sanction for the moral law will be forever ineffectual. I do not deny that approbation by society is not a half-way sanction for the moral law, but, as things are, society is not in a position

to give its approbation or disapprobation to any kind of conduct, for society is tolerating all kinds of immoralism, not only that of the gangster, the racketeer, but of many a "respectable" citizen.

For example, I wonder if you have come across an article by John T. Flynn, entitled "Graft in Business." As a matter of fact, he wrote three articles, out of the first of which, appearing in the *New Republic* on August 5, 1931, I quote:

Federal investigations have shown the existence of commercial bribery which has been allowed to flourish unchecked because of a lack of adequate laws to put a stop to it. Commercial bribery—the secret giving of commissions or other things to employees of customers to induce them to buy or to recommend the purchase of certain supplies—has become a nationwide system. It infects not only the ordinary lines of business but also the professions and also the surgical professions. For example, one dealer admitted to an agent and traveling auditor of the Federal Shipping Board that he had overcharged the Shipping Board about 60 per cent on \$400,000, by reason of a necessity, as he claimed, for giving gratuities in the form of automobiles, whiskey, entertainment

to the captains and stewards. He said the New York office of the Shipping Board had on file cases where stewards had confessed to being paid ten per cent on bills.

And so on.

Well, if this custom is nationwide, does that make it moral? Society seems to put the stamp of approval on that custom; just as, for example, upon the custom of giving and taking tips. You might say that our present civilization couldn't go on without it. This buying of favors is universal, or nearly so; the business world seems to accept it as inevitable and therefore not immoral.

If you ask, "Is that moral?" then you have to answer by asking the question, "What do you mean by moral?" The same thing applies if you are talking about political honesty. When a man occupying a very important political position, carrying with it, I think, a

The man alone, if he has supernatural faith, will be moral, and if all society . . . accepts the Ten Commandments as the everlasting expression of the nature of the mind and the will of God, there will be law and order and good morals.

\$25,000 salary, takes in addition to his salary "emoluments," or "perquisites,"—call it anything but the nasty word graft—and then comes out and says, "Of course I did it. It is the custom. It is the tradition. Everybody's doing it. It is not only winked at; it is approved by the citizenry generally who make no protest against it." Does that make the action moral? Advocates of the "*mores*" system, according to which customs make morals, would be obliged to answer logically, "Yes."

Furthermore, if another man occupying a political position in a state senate allies himself with a public service corporation, and takes from them a salary of \$1,000 a month, and admits—no, not admits but boasts—that he gets another \$1,000 not in salary but for expenses, and on top of that some stock that might have yielded millions in years to come, and says to the citizens, "What of it! what are you going to do about it?" And when the citizens do nothing about it, society does nothing about it, and indeed society at large is indifferent about it, again I say, does the action become moral?

Yet that is the way business is done in this metropolis; it is the way business is done in the whole world. If the citizens don't like it, why don't they rise and prevent it?

Apathy, lethargy, indifference, toleration finally go into the making of public opinion. And if public opinion is the normal standard of morality, according to the favorite ethical theory of the day, the theory which is so frequently exploited and defended by Bertrand Russell—if people tolerate these things to such an extent that public opinion is created, is it then moral or immoral?

You see what I mean. If you make the norm, the standard, the criterion of morality that which society approves, or at least does not disapprove, all this graft—political graft, industrial graft, every sort of graft—is moral. The stamp of approval is placed upon it by an in-

different populace. And I would not even go so far as to maintain that the populace are merely indifferent; I think they are convinced that since things always have been so, they will continue to be so. I have had many a conversation in the last six months or a year about graft of different kinds, and I give you my word I find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to stir up even small groups to resentment against what in my old-fashioned way I would think to be a violation of the moral law.

For example, I was working myself up into something of a froth of excitement about a judge who was alleged to have given \$60,000 to get his position, and to my amazement a friend, a professional man, said, "It is the only way to get it. The new judge had a good record at the bar, he knew his law, he had a right to be a judge, the chance was offered him, the *quid pro quo* had to be handed over. Call it a campaign contribution, call it what you will, but he had to 'plank down' the \$60,000. There wasn't any other way for him to realize his ambition to sit on the bench. Why shouldn't he?"

Then by way of a fillip, this fellow said, "Furthermore, he gets the \$60,000 back in three years."

In other words, I don't think you can rely upon such an elastic thing, such a quick-silver commodity as public opinion as a sanction of the moral law. There has to be something above and beyond and beneath public opinion. Public opinion may go wrong, become even degenerate. There must be some authority better than public opinion.

Well, then, what shall you have? What authority? Some persons who haven't learned their lesson in recent years say, "There ought to be a law. Make a law. The law is above public opinion!"

Of the making of many laws there is no end. There are enough laws produced in one state in ten years to fill this auditorium. There are enough laws

produced in the forty-eight states and in the Federal Legislature to choke up the bottomless pit.

But you cannot reconstruct society by law. Furthermore, almost every thinking man is becoming convinced that state legislatures and federal legislatures are packed with incompetents. It is the daily meat of the newspapers, it is the unfailing theme of the editorial writers that our Congress, both Senate and House, is hopelessly benighted, and sometimes when these "statesmen" come out from the Senatorial or Congressional Halls and try to give account of themselves, perhaps upon the talking screen, they make such asses of themselves that the people say, "Our representatives are boobs! These fellows don't even speak the English language. To all intents and purposes they are backwoodsmen. A lot of men sent to legislate in Washington are nothing but hill-billies. Are you going to tell me that those fellows are going to legislate me into morality? I should say not. I do my own thinking. I am master of my own conscience. That mob down there under the dome at Washington can tell me nothing."

Dear friends, I am quoting literally some business men I know. You are never going to legislate them into correct morality.

What, then, will be your authority? I suppose, being university people, you say, "There should be an analysis and a synthesis of the best ethical opinion from the days of Socrates and Plato and Aristotle down to John Dewey."

Very well, who is going to make it? Any one of the professors in this university or elsewhere? Consider the task of going through the long history of philosophical thought, and especially of ethical thought, analyzing it, extracting the essence from all that vast literature—Socrates, Aristotle, Plato, Spinoza, Schopenhauer, John Locke, John Stuart Mill—everybody down to the most modern—and say, "Out of all that mass

of ethical literature, here is the gist of it. Follow this."

Obviously this is another impossibility. It couldn't be done. No man on earth could do it. And if a man did succeed in the task attempted, the herculean task that would take a lifetime, who would follow it? What obligation would there be upon the individual citizen, upon the politician, upon the business man, to say nothing of the racketeer and gangster—what obligation would there be upon any individual man of following that synthesis of ethical thought through all the centuries?

Our Savior said upon one occasion, "They have Moses, and they have the prophets; . . . If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe if one rise again from the dead." Yes, they have Moses. If they won't believe Moses, who was something of a moralist himself, why should they believe Spinoza? If they won't believe the Ten Commandments and follow them—a pretty good code, I should say, though Bertrand Russell thinks it is hopelessly outmoded and outdated—if they won't follow the Ten Commandments, can you possibly conceive of some code they would follow? If a man argues that not Moses but Hammurabi wrote the Ten Commandments, what difference does that make? Why should one follow Hammurabi if he won't follow Moses? The appeal to the philosophers and even the moralists is to a merely human authority. It is an appeal to an intellectual oligarchy, and no intellectual oligarchy is ever going to run this present world. That is history and that is human nature, too. I don't suppose some of our university people understand the intense antipathy that is stirred up in the mind of the ordinary man when you tell him he has to believe such and such a thing, and do such and such a thing, because a group of the intelligentsia tells him it is the right thing to do. That is the last thing he

will do in the world. You will have to seek elsewhere for your authority.

Consequently, since public opinion won't do it, since legislation cannot do it, and since an appeal to the philosophers and moralists from antiquity down to the present time cannot be the authority, the sanction for the moral law, what is the sanction?

I give you the only sanction that I know. If there isn't a supernatural sanction, if there isn't any God, if there isn't any possibility of communication between man and God—God the principle of all good—if it is forever impossible for man to know the mind of God, knowing the mind and nature of God to know the will of God, then I think you may bid goodbye to any stable system of ethics and to any permanent morality, and the crisis in morals is going to continue until there comes a great crash.

There was a time in the history of Israel when there was no king, and no judge in Israel, so every man did what seemed best in his own eyes. Well, you say that is nihilism. Every man for himself. But no! Not if each and every individual man believes in a God Who is the beginning of all good and the ultimate sanction of all morality. If

he believes in a supernatural authority which he considers himself bound to obey, you don't need any judge, you don't need any king, you don't need any legislature. The man alone, if he has supernatural faith, will be moral, and if all society (legislation or no legislation, philosophical opinion or no philosophical opinion), roughly speaking, is convinced that there is a code of ethics and of morals, the Ten Commandments, and believes that this code is ultimately not from Moses, or even from Hammurabi, if society accepts the Ten Commandments as the everlasting expression of the nature of the mind and the will of God, there will be law and order and good morals. Human theories come and go, philosophers live and die, legislatures work and pass away, but God remains.

The divine law, "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not lie," "Thou shalt not commit adultery," remains not because it is concocted by the mind of man but because it is the expression of the mind and nature and will of God. Then you have a reliable, stable, perpetual, and inviolable basis of morality, and that, as far as I can see it, is the only satisfactory sanction of the moral law.



---

## THE FUTURE OF RELIGION

LOUIS L. MANN

**T**HREE is a feeling abroad today, in some quarters vague and unformulated, and in others clear and crystallized, that religion has failed, or, at least, that people have made a failure of their religion. The confusion in our economic, industrial, and social life, the prevalence of political corruption, the increase of crime, the burden of poverty, the delinquency caused by maladjustment, and the fear of impending war, the insecurity of old age and the increasing unemployment, all seem to point to the fact that we are merely "muddling" through immediate obstacles, rather than grappling with them intelligently. When, in addition to such thought-provoking facts, Fundamentalists emphasize so much that is not fundamental, and attempt to guide life, which is of necessity dynamic and evolving, by an authority that is static and unchanging, is it any wonder that many people are beginning to feel that religion is not "geared" to meet the pace of the modern world?

The religion of the future will not emphasize creed, form, ceremony, ritual, prayer, church affiliation, or church at-

tendance, though all of these will help either to stimulate or to express the religious sentiment, but will view religion as one's faith in a Higher Power as revealed in, by, through, and because of one's actions. It will be what Religion at its best has always been, a way of life, a philosophy of life. It will represent the sum total of relationships that a person can sustain to the universe—to the known and the unknown, material and spiritual, philosophic, metaphysical, sociological, esthetic, artistic, scientific, ethical, moral, economic, domestic, civic, national, international, rational, mystical and every other possible. It will not be *one* thing, except in the sense that it will be *the* one thing, the all-inclusive thing, which enables one to find one's place in the universe and to feel "at home" in the world. If philosophy is, as Plato said, "the science of all sciences," then religion will be the philosophy of all philosophies. It will be nothing fragmentary; it cannot be incomplete; it must strive to be all-inclusive. Nothing human can or will be foreign to the religion of the future.

The religion of the future will be as

much concerned with the shop, the factory, the store, the field, the mine, and the market-place, as it will be with the church; it will be heeded in the storm and stress of life, as much as in the quiet of the sanctuary.

In the religion of the future, men and women, and preachers too, will no longer speak of "a little child leading them" on the seventh day of the week, and sit idly when in days of prosperity more than one million and five hundred thousand children in these United States are being physically stunted, and mentally blunted, and physically dwarfed, and spiritually crushed in the fields and factories and mines.

The religion of the future will not be something final but it will be something evolving, not something "made," rather than "in the making," not something static rather than dynamic. We are living in a world whose fundamental law is evolution. Life evolves; it changes, expands, grows. Religion must lead, else it will have no function. If the religious sanction or authority should be static, while life evolves and is dynamic, then life will forge ahead of religion, and religion instead of leading and being the bearer of light, will be led and find itself in the dark. Unless religion give "light and leading," it will no longer be religion. The religion of the future will not hold on to its so-called "truths" until they lose their truthfulness! It is altogether superficial to speak of the church as "a conservative force," because in reality, religion, by its very nature, must be radical, in fact, revolutionary. Though it be but a "single voice crying in the wilderness," the religion of the future must dare to "Make a highway for God."

In the past, evolution in religion has been unconscious. In the future, it will be conscious. The prophets of the

Nothing human can or will be foreign to the religion of the future.

plausible, and the champions of the status quo will disappear. In the future, religion will, in the Socratic sense, be a stinging gadfly, keeping people alive and alert, with open mind, and open heart, and open soul, to welcome facts, whether they come from science or philosophy, from mystic experiences or rational processes.

One of the most fatal ailments of our present-day religion is that the dead

hand of the past stretches its bony fingers to clutch the living present to the point of strangulation. The religion of the future will not permit "the liv-

ing dogmas of the dead to become the dead dogmas of the living." Dogmas that were living when those now dead created them have now become so much excess baggage, dead weight, and really have become, "dead dogmas of the living." When, for example, some nineteen hundred years ago Jesus and other Jewish leaders of his day thought that the end of the world was at hand, religion took an "other-worldly" trend, and marriage and private property had little value in a world that people believed was about to cease. These ideas were very much alive for the particular age and the hysterical environment; when, however, they were turned into the dogmas of celibacy and poverty long after the fundamental premise of a world coming to an end was abandoned, they became dead dogmas for the living; when the crucifixion story used by Paul as propaganda for the new religion is taught today to innocent children, who because of the setting, in which the Jew is made the satan in the drama of salvation, can never look upon the Jew with an unprejudiced eye or heart, Christianity is undermining much of the love, and peace, and good will which it otherwise might teach. A living dogma of the dead in this way becomes not only a

dead dogma, but a death-giving dogma for the living.

The religion of the future will avoid the blight of institutionalism. Naturally, institutions are necessary; otherwise, ideals would become nebulous and all but evaporate. Most institutions are vital only for a short time. When a religious institution becomes impersonal, stereotyped, and routinized, the spark of the founders ceases to set aglow the lives of the followers, one may see a specimen of "canned religion" and sometimes even worse, "embalmed religion." No longer will religion, in the future, be an account as it so often is now, of the religious experiences that others in the far-distant past have had—ancient history or inaccurate archaeology, but will be something vital, dynamic, and pulsating in their own lives. You cannot feed the hungry by a picture of choice food, and the mere description of what religion meant to Moses, Isaiah, Jesus or Buddha alone, will not feed and nourish the spiritual hungry.

The religion of the future will not be content to stand where Jeremiah, St. Paul, or Moses, Isaiah, St. Francis of Assisi stood, but will strive to stand where they would have stood were they alive. Isaiah knew nothing of modern industrialism, and Jesus knew nothing of child labor. The past, in so far as it represents the accumulated wisdom of experience, has great value, but when it becomes a "finality," it represents a dead weight.

Let the dead past bury its dead  
Act—act in the living present  
Heart within, and God o'erhead.

The religion of the future will not be guilty of bibliolatry; it will not make an idol even of the Bible. What peculiar travesty to take the one book, which more than any other in the world protests against idolatry, and make of it a fetish, an idol! In the words of James Russell Lowell's famous poem "Bibliolatries":

God is not dumb, that he should speak no more;  
If thou hast wanderings in the wilderness  
And findest not Sinai, 'tis thy soul is poor.

Hillel, a rabbi about the time of Jesus, in his famous "Prosbul," abrogated one of the so-called "divine" laws, because it had ceased to operate in a human manner. Nothing is divine unless it is first, human.

The religion of the future will not suffer from the needless divisions in, and multiplication of, denominations. True, denominations represent differences, and differences are natural and helpful. Differences of opinion will not harm; indifference will. The curse of denominationalism lies not in the fact that there are differences, but that their differences hardly differ and merely form barriers and obstacles to friendly co-operation, rather than an incentive for mutual consecration. Many of these denominations are more interested in the success of their particular "ism" and peculiar "oxy" than they are in the success of religion as a whole. When in a little city, the Presbyterian minister was spoken to about the lack of interest in his parish, he spontaneously answered, "thank God, the Baptists aren't even doing that well." There are over one hundred and eighty-three kinds of Christianity in the United States, and over two hundred kinds of Christianity in the world; the pettiness, the jealousy, and the intolerance that characterize some of these sects stand in tragic contrast to that religion which we have defined as the "sum total of the relationships to the known and the unknown," and the ability to see things "sub specie aeternitatis."

Religion came into existence not only because of man's sense of dependence but also to challenge the evils of society. All too frequently in the past it has been too timid in facing the problems of its own day. In the future, the pulpit that waxes eloquent and seems to be charged with convictions against the sins of the Babylonians, Assyrians, and

Egyptians will not fail in its eloquence and in its moral stamina, in its denunciation and open clash with similar sins in its own day. Religion in the future will no longer bless war but realize that in blessing war, it will necessarily damn itself. It will point out the folly, the fallacy, the futility, and the fatality of force. It will not overlook the cheapening of human life in modern industry. It will face the problem of crime and lawlessness, and not be too modest—too hypocritically modest—to bring social disease to the light and remain an idle spectator as the race between "syphilization versus civilization," is being run.

Paradoxical as it may sound the religion of the future will stress the present! Too long has religion spoken of this world as ante-chamber to the world to come—as a place of preparation for the real life. The prophets of Israel let the future world take care of itself. When they spoke of justice, they meant justice here and now. When they spoke of the kingdom of God, they dreamed of a kingdom of righteousness in *this* world. Religion is not preparation for the future life; it is consecration to the present life.

The religion of the future will free itself from the sin of superficiality. As

one cannot become an artist without time and practice, as one cannot become a musician without study and devotion, as one cannot become a scientist without painstaking care and patience, as one cannot study philosophy without profound thought and concentration, as one cannot even become a good golfer without time and practice—as each of these cannot be "had for the asking"—so religion, which is deep as philosophy, broad as history, difficult as metaphysics, complicated as science, harmonious as music, and as compelling as art, will require time, thought, consecration, unselfish service, and self-sacrifice.

Religion in the future will not witness the quarrel of one sect or denomination with another, but will see a unified effort to fight the common enemies of all religions—ignorance, greed, superstition, hatred, malice, ill-will, poverty, disease, war, corruption, unemployment, old age insecurity, child labor, social maladjustment—and thus realize that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than war"—and help to usher in the realization of the poet's vision of the "one far off divine event toward which all creation moves—the service of God and man, the service of God *through* the service of man."



---

## CONSEQUENCES OF EDUCATION WITHOUT RELIGION

GEORGE JOHNSON

AS I understand it, the reason that the Religious Education Association chose as the subject of its deliberation during this, its twenty-ninth annual meeting, those phases of the report of the Wickersham Commission dealing with crime and its causes, was that it regarded the revelations therein contained as a commentary on American education in general and on religious education in particular. That it is in fact such a commentary is undeniable. Education as a moral force is failing to convince a larger and larger proportion of our young people. Religious motives and religious sanctions seem powerless in the face of certain sinister urges that have been generated in the midst of modern society. Facts that cannot be blinked are dissipating smugness. Something is wrong with education and something is wrong with religion in our national life. It behooves us to discover what that something is before the evils at present afflicting us become so deeply rooted as to defy extirpation and thus doom us to that general moral degradation which is always the prelude to national ruin.

We have spent two days in serious study of the facts in the case and have asked ourselves pertinent and fundamental questions. What changes are going on in the moral and religious sanctions for conduct? What factors

enter into man's judgment as to whether conduct is social or anti-social? In what kind of a moral world does the child live? What is the relation between external force and inward compulsion in the development of character?

We have discovered that it is not easy to answer any of these questions categorically. We are dealing with something essentially human and, hence, essentially dramatic, which defies formulation. In two days we have succeeded only in opening the book and perusing the table of contents. As a matter of fact, that is all we intended to do. Such a mastery of the subject as would reveal ways and means of dealing with the problem with some degree of effectiveness must wait on longer and more intensive study.

However, it would not be at all amiss at this point to make certain observations and to indicate a few guide lines for future investigation. That, I take it, is the reason for this evening's meeting. We are gathered here for prognostic purposes, to speak of next steps. May I attempt to formulate for you some convictions that are taking shape in my mind?

\* \* \*

In the first place, it would be interesting to know in how far the American policy of divorcing religion from educa-

tion is responsible for the present situation. Because sectarian differences created certain difficulties in the early part of the last century, we eliminated religion from the curriculum of our schools and developed a system of state supported education based upon religious neutrality. This was not the only possible solution of the problem as is shown in the experience of other countries that have found ways and means of composing sectarian differences without eliminating religion from education.

Now, what has been the effect of this policy? True, it has been the understanding that religious teaching would be taken care of by the home and by the church but this arrangement put the home and the church at a disadvantage. The school bulks large in the child's imagination as the most important educational agency. From the school he gets his first glimpse of the fuller life that lies ahead of him. He has respect for the different disciplines in the curriculum because the school demonstrates to him their importance for adult living. Things not taught in school have not the same importance for him. His out-of-school life has come to be largely devoted to recreation and he resents anything that seriously interferes with it. Hence, religious lessons at home or attendance at church schools after class or on Saturdays and Sundays are more or less of an annoyance. Religion, as he sees it, is something apart from life, something not vitally necessary; something that is more or less of an unnecessary burden.

Generation after generation of our young people have grown up and come to manhood and womanhood with such an attitude toward religion in their hearts. As a consequence, the importance of religion in our national con-

... it would be interesting to know in how far the American policy of divorcing religion from education is responsible for the present situation.

sciousness has gradually declined and today we have thousands of children growing up without even the casual kind of religious education that was formerly given in the home and in the Sunday schools.

This fact must be borne in mind by anyone attempting to make a judgment as to the effectiveness of religion as a force in building up moral sanctions for conduct. Religion cannot be blamed for failing where it has never been tried.

But, you will say, certain religious denominations have refused to accept the compromise of the neutral school and have developed a system of education in which religion is the fundamental ele-

ment and have done this on a voluntary basis. What of the product of these schools? Has religion served as a directing and dominating ideal in their lives? Are there not facts to prove that the army of juvenile delinquents is recruited from their ranks as well as from the ranks of those who attended public schools?

To that question, I might answer first, that we have no adequate statistics to prove anything one way or the other, and, secondly, that in the event that it could be demonstrated that young people who had had their education in schools conducted by religious denominations were proportionately represented among the criminal classes, it might be because these schools are facing insuperable odds, particularly of a financial kind, which prevent them from giving that individual attention and differentiation of treatment which the problem child of the behavior type requires. If they received their share of the public tax to which in all justice they are entitled, they could do their work with greater effectiveness. As it is, they are forced to confine themselves almost exclu-

sively to the education of the normal child.

Again, the child whose schooling has been under religious auspices lives in the general environment that is secularistic and it requires something better than a good, intellectual equipment with its correlative moral character effectually to withstand the temptations to faith and morals which an irreligious society presents. It takes some degree of heroism to stand manfully by religious principles when it is the fashion of the day to smile at religion in a superior way as something that does not deserve the attention of intelligent men.

If the Religious Education Association has any reason for existence at all, I would say then that it is its sacred duty to labor to restore religion to its rightful place in our American educational program. And by religion I do not mean mere social service. Religion is fundamentally the relation between man and his Creator and the sooner that thinking men spike this nonsense of religion without God, the better for all of us. Our reason tells us that there is a God and that we are His creatures and consequently that we belong to Him. It tells us that we do not possess within ourselves the reason for our existence but must find that reason in our Creator. We are made for the glory of God and we achieve that glory by doing God's Will. Religion means, first of all, keeping the First Commandment—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and all thy soul and all thy might and all thy strength." Only when we have done that can we succeed in keeping the Second Commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Whenever man refuses to have God in his knowledge, like the Romans of old, to use the words of St. Paul, he is "delivered up to a reprobate sense." Mr. Wickersham intimated to us the other evening that society has sinned against the criminal perhaps more than the criminal has sinned against society. What created the slums that are supposed to

breed criminals? What is responsible for the distortion of the agencies of justice that has made a mockery of law enforcement? What has operated to render our penal institutions schools of crime and cesspools of degradation?

We blame it on society but society is, in the last analysis, individual men and women. What has happened is that individual men and women have taken for granted that their lives and their talents belong to themselves to do with them whatever they see fit. They have scoffed at the idea that they would be held accountable to their Creator for the use of the talents that have been given to them. They have been dominated by self-interest. When it has not been to the interest of self to have annoying scenes of poverty and sickness and ignorance around, they have become philanthropic and embarked upon ventures of social service. This we call enlightened self-interest, but the great majority of them, including our political, industrial, social, and even religious leaders have not dared because of self-interest to examine the foundations of modern civilization, to discover why it is that some of us can have the advantages only if others of us are doomed to lead sordid, under-privileged, poverty-ridden lives.

Today, throughout the Christian world, we are commemorating the Feast of the Ascension. For two days our attention has been largely confined to the degraded things which men can become if left to their own impulses. This evening we might well lift up our eyes to the throne of God where the human nature assumed by the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity is enthroned in glory at the right hand of the Father. That vision reveals to us the heights to which man can ascend; but he can only ascend to these heights if he empties himself of his pride, his self-sufficiency and realizes that he is a creature made for the purposes of his Creator Whose Will he must do on earth if earth is to take on the semblance of Heaven.



---

## SHALL WE TEACH PRE-DETERMINED SOCIAL-ECONOMIC GOALS AND POLICIES?

FRED J. KELLY

THE present economic crisis must not be allowed to obscure the fact that a social revolution has been sweeping across the nations of the earth for several decades. This revolution has been gathering momentum through all these years, and our present economic chaos is but one of its manifestations. To seek a cure for this economic depression without recognizing it as a part of a wider social maladjustment is fallacious and must lead to disappointment.

The nature of this social maladjustment is the subject of much of our current social-economic literature, and a general knowledge of it may be taken for granted. That it is among the most serious maladjustments in history is commonly acknowledged. That it calls for courageous statesmanship is admitted by all. The situation appears to call not for modification of the old machinery with which social-economic problems were solved, but rather for the creation of a new type of machinery. A new kind of social drive has come into use just as was the case with transportation thirty years ago. At that time even though buggy manufacturers improved the body designs of the buggy, made more resilient springs, and even put

rubber tires on the wheels, the product was still a buggy, and it became quite clear that when the gas engine replaced the horse as the motive power, an entirely new machine was needed. Those who sought to retain the buggy and resist the development of the automobile soon discovered the futility of their efforts.

The time has come when education must move forward to a new front. My proposal is that education shall assume responsibility (1) to set forth what the fundamental social-economic goals of America are, and the policies and practices most likely to achieve those goals; and (2) to use all the agencies of education, the schools, colleges, churches, and the like, in a concerted effort to create and maintain an enlightened public opinion in support of those goals, policies and practices.

The machinery which education should set up to carry out the above object need not concern us now except in so far as it is helpful in making clear the practicability of the plan. The following is suggested, therefore, not as a part of the argument but as one way in which it would appear feasible to go about the task which my proposal in-

volves. The social-economic goals of America are embodied in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and in the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States. This spirit could be made meaningful and dynamic by having its application to our social-economic life set forth in a series of fundamental statements. These statements, when combined, would constitute a sort of social-economic charter, the basic principles of which would underlie all our social-economic organization and program. On the foundation of this charter, a body of policies would be built up, the popular understanding and support of which are essential to the safety and well-being of the people. To prepare the charter, to formulate the policies under it, and to meet the constant needs of revision of both charter and policies, a congress of the best informed scholars and other leaders in social, economic, and political science fields should be called under the sponsorship of education. This congress should meet long enough and often enough to do well its difficult but basically important task.

When goals and policies are thus formulated it becomes the central purpose of education to develop a program in schools, colleges, churches, clubs, parent-teacher associations, and the like, which will assure an enlightened and active support of them by the public. This program must involve both methods and materials of instruction in the schools and colleges, as well as programs of adult education by other agencies.

It will be understood that other significant changes must also take place in education besides the one involved in the proposal here advanced. The seven cardinal objectives—health, command of the fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocational guidance and training, civic education, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character—will have to become the outcomes constructively sought by the schools. The church, or some other agency, will have to avail

itself of the unprecedented chance to institute a systematic program of adult education for culture and leisure, as well as for spiritual growth. Other fundamental changes will suggest themselves. All such changes will find their chief bulwark of strength in an enlightened public who unite in the support of such social-economic goals and policies as have been formulated by those of our leaders best qualified to make such a formulation in the interest of the public.

\* \* \*

With these brief explanations I may now proceed to the defense of my proposal. To restate it—I am charging education with the responsibility of teaching a body of information, and thus of consciously molding public opinion in support of a pre-determined set of social-economic goals and policies which are held to be best suited to achieve our personal and national aspirations.

The conscious effort to develop an active public opinion through education is not novel. It has prevailed in all times, and prevails today in all countries. "Use Pepsodent tooth paste twice a day, and see your dentist at least twice a year."

Or, "Republican leaders, including Representatives Snell and Tilson, voted against the bill, indicating that the Hoover administration has not yet grasped the one remedy, etc." as seen by the reporter of the *Philadelphia Record*, May 3, 1932.

Certainly Russia would not dream of undertaking her bold experiment without using her educational system to bring an understanding of its purposes and plans to the youth, and through them to the older generation. The National American Red Cross builds its future support on the sure foundation of the Junior Red Cross of today.

Please bear in mind that it is not a question of whether conscious and concerted effort shall be exerted in the formation of public opinion. Such con-

certed effort always has and always will be made. The pros and cons of all sorts of controversial issues are set forth by agencies of all kinds every day. But in most of these cases, the agencies are not interested primarily in truth, or in the faithful portrayal of the facts in the case. The question is whether we shall leave the matter of molding public opinion entirely to the agencies with a personal or commercial interest to serve, or whether we shall ask those agencies with only social and public interests to serve to take a hand in the game too.

But those who fear the policy of using the schools for the molding of public opinion offer one or more of three reasons for their fear. First, if people are educated they can be trusted to form their own opinions when the time comes. This reason, even if valid decades ago, certainly cannot be accepted as sound today when the questions involved in almost any of the complex social-economic issues which face this generation have their roots in a mass of data so baffling that even those who devote their lives to the study of them find it well nigh impossible to encompass the necessary information. No field has ever been so rich for quackery and demagogery as the social-economic field is today. This result is inevitable as long as we leave to an uninformed public opinion questions so complicated as birth control, joining the league of nations, inflation of the currency, farm relief, unemployment insurance, regulation of public utilities, divorce laws, and scores of other almost equally difficult problems. The situation becomes all the more impossible when tremendous financial interests are involved.

Long ago we recognized the place of expert opinion in less complicated fields. When our child is sick we do not think it beneath our intellectual dignity to say, "I don't know what is the matter with Mary. I guess I'll call a doctor." When we want to build a bridge across a stream we don't sit around the grocery

store stove and debate the matter and then vote that a twelve-inch steel beam is strong enough. No, it has now become good form to acknowledge that we do not know bridge building. We call in an engineer. But when it comes to practices such as manipulating the stock exchange, that matter is so simple that a majority vote should settle it. We all have equal wisdom in that sphere, even though our combined wisdom is a large factor in wiping away the savings of millions of our people, and setting them staring at the spectre of want.

Education in the schools should give us the tools with which to pursue our developing intellectual, social, and esthetic interests. To conclude from this that all of us, even when the time comes that nearly all shall have had twelve years of schooling, should be able to arrive at a safe conclusion on the multitude of amazingly complex social-economic issues of our times, is to miss the essential point of education. Education should teach us the place of expert knowledge or opinion. In this day of specialization only those who devote their lives to the given specialty can be expected to possess adequate information to counsel wisely in any great field of human interest. We do not regard it necessary to read the medical journals, the dental journals, and the mining journals in order that we may have an informed opinion on these questions. No, we take the word of the scholars in these fields, and teach it in the schools. We teach the desirability of vaccination, the need of vitamin B, the dangers of the common drinking cup, and so forth, with no serious charge of the improper use of the schools to develop a public opinion. If, however, we teach that industry should be so organized as to serve public interest rather than private interest, we are charged with the improper use of education.

My contention is that the question of industry's obligation to the public is of such a nature that experts should pass

upon it just as experts pass upon vaccination. If that expert judgment is that industry should be so organized as to serve public interest rather than private interest, we should teach that throughout our educational system. Why should we be limited in our treatment of social-economic issues in the schools to giving the evidences on both sides of each question and be precluded from expressing our judgment about their merits while we may say to the children, "eat more green vegetables?" The assumption has been, apparently, that each individual is capable of weighing the evidences for himself in issues like tariff, industrial management, international relations, and so forth, whereas in matters such as the food values in vegetables, the facts are so difficult of understanding that we are at liberty to accept the judgment of experts and teach the children to live in conformity with that judgment.

It will be observed that I have selected examples from the world of science which are still controversial. I have done so purposely. They make clear that the issue is not one of certainty in science versus uncertainty in the social-economic field. Rather, we have been accustomed to thinking that social-economic issues are to be settled by much talk by all of us while medical issues are to be settled by the expert judgment of the doctors. We would rather accept the more than an occasional mistake of the doctor than array our volume of talk against him in the solution of medical science issues.

\* \* \*

The time has come to recognize that a general school education does not prepare our people to exercise their sovereign right to diagnose the maladies prevalent in our complex social-economic life any more than it fits them to diagnose the illness of our children. We maintain actual control of medical matters by reserving to the legislative branch of our government the right to

make laws regulating medical practice. Of course, the same should remain true concerning social-economic matters. The legislative branch of the government must always have responsibility for crystallizing into law whatever social-economic policies are regarded as best at the time. Education should assume responsibility for teaching what the expert judgments are in social-economic issues, exactly the same as what the expert judgments are in other issues.

If ever we needed a clear demonstration of the fallacy of the belief that people when educated can be depended upon to arrive at a sound opinion on social-economic questions without the aid of any concerted public policy to bring them the results of expert study, the experience of the last two decades—particularly the last three years—should afford that demonstration.

The second objection raised to the use of the schools for the development of a public opinion respecting social-economic questions is that the schools cannot be trusted to have the right opinion themselves. So great wisdom is not believed to reside in the schools. In answer, let me say, that being of the schools myself, I disclaim the possession of such wisdom. But I observe a technique in common use among other agencies which I think we might use. The Federal Radio Commission employs the best radio engineers it can find. The Federal Tariff Commission employs the best economists it can find. Even the Senate Committee on Banking employs an investigator who presumably knows his way around Wall Street. Why cannot education have the benefit of the services of social-economic experts? For some years, schools have employed so-called educational experts to apply measurements to the results of our efforts in teaching reading, arithmetic, and the like. We can have experts to tell us how well we are doing what we are doing, but we haven't had experts to tell us whether what we are doing is

what we ought to do. Partly, at least, on that account we find ourselves now in the unpleasant predicament of doing very well what we are doing, but of discovering that what we are doing is not what we ought to be doing!

"But," insist these doubters, "social-economic experts have not yet developed their science so that their opinions are trustworthy. They may plunge the country into ruin." That is a reply tinged with an irony, these days, but never mind that. Weren't we taught that the atom was the smallest particle of matter? Even the fact of three dimensional space which has always seemed so reasonable to all but a dozen mortals may prove to have been a delusion. Nothing is certain. But you wouldn't have us quit developing a public opinion about the germ theory of typhoid fever merely because someday we may learn that germs don't cause it. You wouldn't want your dentist to tell you when you go to him with a toothache, "The dental profession is yet uncertain just what is the correct treatment for toothache. Therefore, you go on back home, and when we have reached an agreement among us, I'll call you."

But the case is not so bad as that. There is a surprising agreement on most of our fundamental issues among our social-economic experts who have no connections which dull their interest in the truth. Our situation is a case of where the doctors agree, but the people, because they can't see the typhoid germs, still continue to drink contaminated water. *My proposal is that education should provide for a congress of social-economic scholars who have no axes to grind.* This congress should set itself the task of telling us what we can most safely believe with respect to those important issues upon which our welfare so much depends. This social-economic congress would be to education what the research departments are to the great industrial concerns, or what the technical

staffs are to the several administrative boards of our government.

Just how such a congress should be organized is immaterial. It should represent the most unbiased and the best informed persons in the social-economic field. Its findings would constitute a sort of platform upon which educators who desire to follow expert judgment in teaching the social sciences could stand. Those issues upon which wide differences of opinion were found to exist in such a congress would naturally be treated by teachers as controversial. No particular judgment concerning them would be taught. With respect to the great majority of issues, however, it is assumed that reasonable agreement would be reached, and these could be taught with safety and propriety in the schools, colleges, and churches.

The third objection raised to using the schools to develop an informed public opinion is that it will stop growth, prevent change, make society static, and hence start decay. This is the most fundamental objection of the three. It has been the curse of indoctrination throughout all ages. A church, for example, evolves a body of doctrine, and sets the machinery of indoctrination grinding and awakens after a few centuries to wonder what is the matter with the vitality of the church. A certain Teutonic nation adopted about 1875 a certain body of national doctrine, and set the school indoctrination machinery going only to learn in 1918 that in spite of the willingness of that great people to eat weeds and straw, something had gone wrong with the doctrine. Such cases are cited to make entirely clear the fact that I perceive the dangers of indoctrination. No policy of using the schools to develop a pre-determined public opinion is tolerable or thinkable which does not provide within itself for constant change. Institutional doctrine is too often set in a relatively changeless mold. When the mold is changeless, indoctrination means certain decay. But

in the proposal I am making there is not only provision for change in the mold, but a far greater assurance of change than under the present plan. Change is slow, inevitably, when the nation moves through such a morass of conflicting public opinion as is bound to result when the molding of public opinion is left largely to those who serve selfish and therefore conflicting purposes. A unified public opinion would at least bring a given policy to an adequate test more promptly than the zig-zag advance which we now make.

Furthermore, no one would expect to throttle independence of thought on the part of those who advance far enough in the field to use it. Research is established in this country as a pace maker in all lines—scientific and pseudo-scientific. Research workers would be the backbone of the social-economic congress which from time to time would revise its theories or policies in the light of new truth. Medicine does not stop work upon any of its assumed truths merely because for the time being it accepts them *and teaches them*. Research

is going on all the time to check medical opinion—we call it medical science.

No one cherishes more than I the priceless quality of American education which says: "the thing that is important is the individuality and ability of every child. Develop them to their full power, give to every person his full opportunity and you will give to the country the richest educational fruitage." What I am advocating in the way of teaching a body of social-economic principles and policies to the children and to adults who want light on the subject is certainly not inconsistent with the doctrine of developing the personality of each individual. Those individuals competent to lead the country's thinking in social-economic lines will have even more encouragement than now to do so because they will have a mechanism with which they can be effectual. They will be on a par in their realm with the scientific scholars in their's. Science has had its patrons in industry and healing. Social science can have only the public it serves as its patron, and the agency through which the public serves itself is education.



---

## COMMON NEEDS AND OBJECTIVES OF CHURCH AND STATE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

PHILIP A. PARSONS

IN compliance with a request from the chairman of the committee in charge of the program of the Pacific Coast Regional Conference on Religion and Higher Education, this paper was designed to furnish a basis for discussion and present a statement of certain important social aspects of religion common to Jews, Catholics, and Protestant Christians. In preparing this paper, the writer was not unaware of the delicate nature of the task in view of historic causes of conflict. The risks involved, however, were not so great as might appear upon the surface, since it was understood that, for the time being at least, traditional points of controversy were to be barred from the discussion.

We are obliged by reason of the limitations of a thirty-minute paper to confine ourselves to a few fundamentals, and perhaps it is better so.

A few definitions may serve to clear the atmosphere at the start. I shall approach these from the standpoint of the sociologist who is supposed to stand upon the side lines and consider all institutions as tools by which men have sought to serve their needs and gain their ends. I shall endeavor to make

these definitions as general as possible to avoid confusion which might arise over points of difference, yet specific enough so that all may understand the meaning of the terms involved as they recur in this paper and in the ensuing discussion.

It will be necessary first of all, since this is a conference on religious education, to give a working definition of *religion*.

*Religion*, in its broadest sense, is the sum total of men's ideas, beliefs, actions, and practices which have resulted from their efforts to adjust themselves to the *supernatural* world.

By the *supernatural world* I mean that part of the universe which remains empirically unknown and mysterious, but in which, since remotest times, man has apprehended both intelligence and power.

Aside from certain physical factors which condition life on this earth, such as heat and cold, food and water, and altitude, I am convinced that *religion* has been the most important factor in the development of what we call human culture. In all civilizations men have realized this importance and have set up

machinery in the form of social organizations or institutions to control and direct man's efforts to adjust himself to the conditions of the supernatural world. This is particularly true when those efforts have to do with things which are vital to the whole social body or any important part of it.

The *Church*, as that term is used in this paper, is the machinery which is set up in the modern world to control, direct, and carry on or perform the functions of religion as it has become institutionalized in the course of time. I need only to state a historical fact which

we will not debate, that the three great religions represented here, Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant, are, from the standpoint of the sociologist, outgrowths of a religious system which apparently had its origin and certainly its growth and development in Palestine between the approximate dates of fifteen hundred B. C. and the beginning of what we now call the Christian Era. These religions naturally have several important things in common, chief among which I would place the same general conception of the supernatural world, the same general conception of the nature of the Deity and His relation to men, and the same fundamental set of moral or ethical ideas. In other words, up to a certain point they are parts of an identical ethical monotheism. It follows naturally, therefore, that in their efforts to serve God and do His will they have certain identical objectives. These we shall have occasion to discuss later. We need only mention them here.

Just as men have found it necessary to set up institutions to deal with their relations to the supernatural world, so, also, they have found it necessary to regulate and control their relations to each other in society. The *State*, therefore, is that complex of social organi-

zation set up for this purpose. In time it, also, becomes institutionalized. In other words, the state is organized society. Theoretically, at least, the purpose of the state is to control those affairs and relationships which are or are thought to be of vital importance to the whole social body.

Since the ancient states of Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor were practically without exception religio-centric or theocratic, the interests and objectives of organized religion and of the state were identical. This was only partly true of Greece and Rome. Again

in the so-called dark ages, in which the peoples and culture of the Modern World were being born, society was again theocratic until conflicting interests between organized religion and the civil state precipitated that struggle which eventually resulted in the more or less complete organic separation with which we are familiar in our time. Historically this conflict of interests has been permitted to overshadow the fact that both organized religion and organized society still have many important things in common, which must be conserved if either the church or the state is to survive.

With these introductory definitions in mind the following paper is arranged to discuss:

First, the *Sociological Importance of Religion*,

Second, the *Objectives and Needs of the Church*,

Third, the *Objectives and Needs of the State*, and

Fourth, *Some Common problems which confront the Church and the State*.

#### I. RELIGION AND ITS IMPORTANCE

I have said above that with certain reservations religion has been the most important factor in human experience. There are many reasons why this is so.

The only ends which a civilized state can permit and survive must, after all, be social; that is, spiritual.

I shall have time to mention only a few of the most important here. It will be kept in mind that we are speaking of religion in what the sociologists and historians call the Western world,—in other words, our world.

With few exceptions, if any, the moral traditions of the primitive peoples who were eventually to create the historic civilized states were imbedded in tribal custom. With few exceptions, also, as their tribal organization began to break down, necessitating the setting up of civil institutions, the moral traditions made the transition from tribal custom to a body of ethical concepts imbedded in the rising folk religion which is to become the so-called national religion of the civilization to be. In this way the moral code is preserved and survives the disintegration of the tribal institutions. When once the moral code has become identified with the will of a Deity or *the* Deity it survives without any profound changes as long as the will of that Deity dominates the life of his worshipers. In this process of transition from custom to religion, the moral code, in so far as it remains a social code, comes to epitomize the fundamental aspirations of the human heart. With the question as to how and when these aspirations came to be in the human heart we are not concerned here. When they are identified with God and definitely accepted as a part of the supernatural world they become the lofty goal of conscious human effort, the divine objective of noble striving. So it may be said that the goal of a state dominated by an ethical religion is the individual and collective approximation of divinity.

I believe, therefore, that this epitomizing of man's fundamental aspirations and their identification with the will of God is sociologically a function of first magnitude. Once this has been achieved, organized religion assumes the task of preserving and transmitting the moral tradition from one generation to the

next. The Church becomes the great conservator and arbiter of morals than which there is no more important function in human society. In so far as this function produces results which are socially sound, the Church performs a socially necessary task and its continued existence is vital to the state.

Finally, organized religion has always created a complex of notions and ideas about the social institutions of marriage, law, and government and to a lesser degree around the institutions of property and education. This I have called an *atmosphere of sanctity*, for when the ideas and notions surrounding these become identified with the divine will the institutions themselves become divine and long resist the familiar and indifferent attitudes which accompany purely secular things. The moment any or all of these institutions lose their sanctity and become secular they begin to function improperly and critical problems confront the state.

From a sociological standpoint, therefore, I am listing the vital functions of religion as the identification of the moral code with the divine will, the preservation and transmission of the moral code, and the placing of an atmosphere of sanctity about the other social institutions.

## II. THE OBJECTIVES AND NEEDS OF THE CHURCH

It is an extremely interesting and important fact of cultural evolution that Judaism should survive and become one of the three important religious organizations of modern Christendom. Following the collapse of the Hebrew State it managed to resist the ravages of time and the religious, social, and political assaults of the next eighteen hundred years. When the pulsing life of the modern world burst out of the shell in which it had been incubating through the so-called dark ages, we find the same conception of a God of Righteousness dominating the organized activity of the scattered followers of the Ancient God

of Israel, the now ancient Catholic Church and the young but tremendously dynamic Protestant Christianity. All three, albeit their ultimate objectives were more or less unlike, sought to obtain these objectives by very much the same means:—belief in the same God, the teaching of the same code of ethics, and carrying on their propaganda about the same general core of sacred scriptures in which the same moral code was imbedded. Each sought zealously to safeguard and perpetuate the same moral tradition by the process of teaching and preaching, almost identical in content and, designed for whatever ultimate purpose, its immediate result was the creating of moral character by education and precept. In other words, the moral tradition which each sought to preserve and transmit was identical in content. To this day the Church remains the chief ostensible custodian and promoter of this traditional morality. As yet no other machinery has been devised for performing this task, and all efforts to do this particular job by other means have been practically negligible as to results. At the present time I think I can safely say that as a preserver and transmitter of the moral tradition and in the formation of what we call Christian character, the Church has not now and never has had a competitor worthy of the name.

I am not concerned just here with the conditions which have interfered with the performance of this all important function. This I shall consider in part IV of this paper. It suffices here to say that as long as the Church occupied a central position of dignity and respect in society it performed this task effectively. Not until it was dislodged from this central position and found itself compelled to compete with numerous other interests and often at a great disadvantage did its efforts become ineffective. In order to do its work well once more it needs first of all, let me say, to have the importance of its services to society

recognized. It needs a reasonably fair opportunity to perform its task. If the work it has done is as vital as we here conceive it to be, the Church must be restored to a position of importance and influence in the social life.

In order to get these opportunities the Church needs to find a place for itself not already preëmpted by some other agency such as school, or newspaper, or magazines, or amusement, or recreation or what not. Whenever it has attempted to compete with these it has made a sorry spectacle of itself. In the field of satisfying the spiritual hunger of men it has no competitor. This and the task of conserving and transmitting morals or building character remain the fields in which it has been eminently successful and in which it has no competition worthy of the name.

But times and conditions change. The simple exhortation to practice the ten commandments does not solve the problem of adjusting the conflicting interests of industry, business, and politics. In matters of both public and private morality it needs to define its position in the interest of social as well as individual righteousness, and stand unequivocally for that position.

To do this the Church must keep abreast of known truth as demonstrated by both physical and social science, and having found that truth it needs to rise indignantly before doors of iniquity, either political, economic, or social, like the prophet in Naboth's vineyard and declare that Jehovah will not permit the thing. The church needs to have its own machinery for finding truth and be unafraid to accept it when found. It needs to hold symposia periodically to determine what progress has been made in this search for truth and to adapt its programs to new truth as it appears. Then and not till then will it have a right to assert its leadership and supremacy in moral and spiritual matters. In addition, the Church needs the support of devoted men and women who are

also intelligent and well informed. The forces of vice and greed may well laugh at the devotion of the stupid and the ignorant. Nor does such devotion command the respect of a world in need of spiritual guidance.

### III. THE OBJECTIVES AND NEEDS OF THE STATE

In outlining the objectives and needs of the state I can be very brief. Above all else the State needs righteous citizens. We are learning to our sorrow that it cannot coerce individuals into conformity with social requirements who are not already minded to social behavior. The state needs devoted and disinterested service. Without these it bogs down in a chaotic welter of conflicting interests. With all the dependence which the state has placed on free and compulsory education it has failed dismally in producing outstanding morality, statesmanship, and disinterested public service. Where these qualities have been conspicuous it is seldom difficult to trace them to their proper source in early moral training. In other words, within certain limits which all will recognize, the needs and objectives of the church and the state are identical. When the church falters on the job the state suffers.

### IV. THE COMMON PROBLEMS WHICH CONFRONT THE CHURCH AND THE STATE

First let us consider some of the problems which have arisen out of what is in some respects at least the unfortunate separation of learning and religion.

The historic conflict between science and organized religion has been disastrous to both. The separation of religious and moral instruction from public formal education has tended to give undue emphasis to scientific or empirical knowledge. The sharp differentiation between the sacred and the secular which the young meet for the first time in the elementary sciences comes as a stunning blow for which no provision has been made to cushion the

impact. The oft heard statement that they must face the facts and adjust themselves to them because they are facts is a monstrous fallacy. We hear no such argument for allowing children to play with firearms or for leaving poisons about in order to teach them discrimination. Where maturity of mind and judgment are not present exposure to certain incontrovertible facts may be just as deadly to mind and character as pistols are to life.

What I have called the atmosphere of sanctity is not created by a teaching process alone. In the main, it is the result of a process of absorption in which the young sense an attitude of reverence and acquire reverence in a multitude of situations both unconsciously and consciously. Conscious, definite and isolated teaching was a relatively small part of the process. When parents and older members of the family and the group were obviously reverent regarding certain things at stated times and certain other things at all times, the young naturally developed the same attitudes. The conscious transmission of the moral tradition was embedded in the religious tradition than which there was nothing else more sacred. Apart from the teaching process there were occasions for the pointing of a moral, and pious parents were not loath to resort to an appeal to sanctity to secure obedience in countless situations in which morality was not necessarily involved. All of the important occasions in life were sacred and accompanied by at least a degree of solemnity.

We need not recount the processes by which the realm of the secular assumed the ascendancy. When the modern world pinned its hope upon education and set out to construct the colossal machinery for acquiring and transmitting it, it is little short of tragic from a sociological standpoint that the process of transmitting the moral tradition with its accompanying atmosphere

of sanctity was rigidly and designedly excluded from the process. Perhaps in the nature of things it was unavoidable; at least it is futile to speculate upon it. At any rate, those who felt the necessity of transmitting the moral tradition found themselves obliged to undertake it as a separate process or to identify it with the transmission of the religious or theological tradition. Unfortunately certain outwardly conspicuous results were mistaken for success. It is not until in the exuberant pursuit of secular education we find the social institutions slipping one by one and unescapably from the realm of the sacred to that of the secular that we realize the outward evidences of morality are accompanied by very little solid inner substance.

As this process goes on a sinister change is taking place in the social body itself. One by one the old stable social groups disintegrate and society becomes an aggregation of persons who are practically strangers to each other. The neighborhood group dissolves. The play groups and the work groups become dissociated from family life. The family group disintegrates. The religious group becomes separated from the neighborhood, its own energies dissipated by denominational strife. Thus all semblance of a united, orderly, and well organized movement for moral education and character building reaching the entire community disappears. It goes without saying that this is as disastrous to the state as it is to organized religion. Unfortunately the gravity of the situation is obscured by the loud claims of success of this or that organization attempting to meet a particular situation with a particular mode of procedure, but the undeniable fact remains that we are getting a harvest of human beings characterless and unmoral, from whose formative years practically all effective moral education and character forming experience have been excluded. If one doubts this let him consider business, industry, politics, international relations,

or the collapse of our economic institutions. The absence of conspicuous leaders in any or all of these fields at this critical time is not accidental. Our boasted enthronement of reason brought neither right, justice, nor mercy to the seat of power.

\* \* \*

Before concluding this paper I would call to your attention a condition which might escape the theologian or the philosopher but which is quite obvious to the sociologist. It seems to be in the nature of things that the young are social. If their tender years are reasonably free from privation or suffering they are optimistic, hopeful. I believe that I have the authority of the psychologists behind me also in stating that as they approach maturity biologically their social impulses manifest themselves in idealistic dreamings. They long to do great things, noble things; they would right the wrongs of the world, they would create a new heaven and a new earth. You know what I mean. In over a score of years of university experience I find this idealistic quality of young people unchanged. From the standpoint of the sociologist, this natural social idealism of youth is an asset of society as undeniably as the fertility of the soil, the forests upon the hillside, or ore in the mines. Properly nourished and directed it matures into responsible parenthood, good citizenship, business and professional integrity, and a sense of duty to society and one's fellows. In other words, it is the foundation of what we call character.

Let us frankly admit that this idealism and aspiration are bound up with all sorts of illusions, or shall we say, juvenile conceptions of man and the universe. But these illusions also are social assets if they strengthen the sense of social responsibility and make for social behavior. Somewhere a great many people have gotten the notion that these juvenile conceptions or illusions are to be gotten rid of by all means and at the

earliest possible moment. This, perhaps, is the most monstrous illusion that has ever possessed or obsessed the mind of man. Sociologically it is highly important that social illusions should not be disturbed until the individual has passed through the developmental period and is capable mentally and biologically of forming mature judgments. Premature disillusionment, that which occurs before what we call character is formed, interferes with the process of carrying over the idealism of youth to the sense of responsibility of the socialized adult. Idealism and devotion are invaluable to society. Idealism is born of youth, devotion is born of religion, namely that adjustment which the individual finally makes to certain great spiritual conceptions or ideas or verities, as you will. Without these adjustments the individual remains the rest of his life purposeless, cynical, useless, or dangerous as may be. At present such idealism and devotion as are brought to most state and many private institutions of higher learning are apt to be promptly and somewhat ruthlessly dispelled by a materialistic secular educational process from which valuable spiritual elements have been all but excluded or in which they remain clandestinely rather than by right of worth.

From a sociological standpoint the mere impartation of factual knowledge, the equipment of the student with certain methodology or techniques, or, if you will, training in the use of his mind

does not constitute an education. The all important consideration is what use the individual is going to make of this equipment. Unless it makes him a satisfactory member of the social group the process is faulty. Education cannot be considered as an end in itself, in other words. Sociologically it is a means to an end. The only ends which a civilized state can permit and survive must, after all, be social; that is, spiritual. Such ends cannot be counted upon in an educational program from which character building has been excluded.

\* \* \*

We conclude with a few propositions drawn from the foregoing assumptions. In the past religion has performed a vital service to society as a part of its natural functioning. Certain conditions interfere with the performance of that function at present. If that function is to be performed by religion in the future some reorganization of both religious and secular education may be necessary. As a first step a revaluation of religion is inevitable. Next a fuller appreciation of the service religion may render is imperative. Finally, religion must accept the world and society as they are if it is to assist in making them what we believe they ought to be. With the means to these ends, we are not concerned in this paper. We have attempted to set forth herein certain basic principles which should at least be the basis of sympathetic discussion.

\* \* \*



---

## RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

JACOB KOHN

THE primary object of this conference as I view it is not to demonstrate the possibility of our co-operation in the field of religious endeavor. It is true that our meeting here is particularly heartening and significant. It represents one of the higher aspects of our American civilization. It constitutes a reaffirmation of the principles of American citizenship which from the beginning has sought to hold within its embrace men of different creeds and various breeds, and to bind them in the bonds of fellowship and brotherly love.

Yet it ought not require the gesture of this conference to prove that we are capable of assimilating these higher aspects of our civilization. If the leaders of religion and the preachers of morality, if the educators and guides of our youth, were not capable of recognizing the fact that men can co-operate without compromise of their convictions then it would be hopeless indeed to expect the rank and file of American citizenship to rise above vulgar prejudice and racial chauvinism.

Our aim is, therefore, not to meet for the purpose of co-operation but to co-operate in order to advance religious education and to establish the claim of religion on the mind of the intelligent young people attending our state universities and secular institutions of higher learning. I believe that we ought willingly face the situation and reconcile our-

selves to the fact that public education in its elementary as well as in its higher phases must in accordance with the American scheme remain wholly secular. This does not imply the denial that religion is an essential element in a full and well rounded education. What it does imply however is the recognition that the state is powerless to supply the individual with a complete education. It is the business of the home, the church, and the synagogue to supplement the endeavors of the state and to draw upon their own spiritual resources to surround our youth with those influences deriving from religious education.

It is true that the university, without assuming a denominational position, may occasionally make room in its curriculum for some form of theistic philosophy or some course in comparative religion. Such courses, however, would not meet the needs of this religious conference, and that, not only because the subjective life of the particular professor may color his presentation of the subject but because we are not inclined to identify education about religion with religious education. It is a common error to suppose that religion can best be taught by one whose attitude toward historic religions is purely neutral and who is concerned only with the least common denominator involved in the religious faiths. The saints and mystics of the great religions of the world, whether Christian

or Jewish, Mohammedan or Buddhist, have more in common with one another than they have with one who can investigate all religions with smug and complacent aloofness. Religion involves not merely the contemplation of certain doctrines, certain spiritual experiences or certain types of discipline, but the positive commitments of man's personality to these faiths and ways of life. Religious education, therefore, means more than a knowledge of the histories and institutions of the religions of the world but deals with the rational and the spiritual value of these commitments and convictions constituting the religious life, as expressed in religious communions such as are represented here. Public education may train the individual for useful and intelligent citizenship within the state. It is our claim, however, that a human being is more than a citizen and that he must learn to live not only with his fellow citizen but with his fellowman and in the presence of realities which transcend the state. Such education in a democracy recognizing no established church devolves upon the churches themselves and can be effectively carried on only if they co-operate to that end.

There is a general feeling on the part of parents that the education which young people receive at the university tends to wean them from religious faith and observance. Many ministers of religion speak with dismay of the shock upon the adolescent mind of the weight of secular, critical, and scientific training which begin to absorb the spiritual energies of the student in the halls of the university. Versus a "Weldtanschauung" and a "Lebensschauung" hitherto determined largely by religious and ethical considerations, there is pitted a view of history and of human society derived through critical analysis and determined by casual

... the state is powerless to supply the individual with a complete education. It is the business of the home, the church, and the synagogue to supplement the endeavors of the state . . .

sequence. The sheer weight of this secular learning impinging upon the sensitive mind of the adolescent bears down the religious aspirations which home and church sought to awaken. It is, therefore, claimed that unless the university teaches religion with the same authority with which it offers instruction in arts and sciences there is no hope for religious education.

I believe that this is erroneous and that the analysis of the situation is not entirely adequate. The conflict in the minds of our young people is not a question of secular versus religious atmosphere. It is rather a contrast in the mind of the

student between a religious training that was purely juvenile in its scope and a secular culture presented in mature fashion as to mature minds. This results in the student classing religion and all that it entails with what is childish and immature; whereas history, science, and sociology are taken to be the sole fit preoccupation of the developed intelligence.

Now as a matter of fact it is only when young people have attained the college age that the essential nature of the religious life and the deeper ethical demands made upon human personality can really begin to be taught.

If you ask the average young person what the Bible is about he will be likely to say offhand that the Bible is a book which contains the stories of Adam and Eve, of the patriarchs, of Moses and the prophets and, if he be a Christian, of the characters of the New Testament. Every student of the Bible knows that though children may profitably be told stories the Bible is not essentially a chronological or a mirror of folk lore. From the Jewish standpoint, for instance, the most important element of the Bible is Torah. The Torah represents an authoritative

Way of Life. It concerns itself with the legal institution of the Jewish people, with the laws governing the relations of man to man within the home and in the market place, with the relations of the sexes to one another, with moral precept and with ritual norms. The Bible, though it contains no systematic speculative philosophy, contains the raw material of many theologies, presents such problems as are involved in the book of Job, is tinged with the gentle skepticism of Ecclesiastes and publishes the social visions of the prophets involving certain views of social justice that are even today matters of grave controversy. The Bible and the religions founded upon it deal with passions which they would curb and passions which they would stimulate. The love of God, which is always a spiritual passion and maybe an intellectual passion, requires, like all human feeling, a certain emotional maturity for its comprehension with which the child is not endowed. The result is that in teaching sacred doctrine or sacred literature to children we naturally omit most of the deeper phases.

The ethics taught the child and which the young person associates with religious teaching consists simply of a group of Sunday school precepts. It contains admonitions concerning reverence for parents, the simple rules of honesty and certain other commandments within the radius of childish experience. The commandment, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife," has only a little less meaning for the child than the psalmist's description of religious longing in the words, "As the hart panteth for brooks of water so panteth my soul for thee, O Lord." In consequence the early religious education of any young person fails to deal with the deeper moral problems which perplex the adolescent and with all the profounder emotions upon which religion feeds.

Religious thought finds itself in the same position. Save in the case of an oc-

casional prodigy, intellectual immaturity goes hand in hand with emotional immaturity. Religion never has an opportunity in the period of childhood and early youth to present the case of religious philosophy, or to lead the child along paths of a rational theology which might orientate the inquiring mind entering upon paths of scientific interest and investigation. Even the best of teachers and the most efficient of schools will not avail. Therefore, our young people, as they attain a degree of physical and intellectual maturity and are brought face to face with a body of secular culture, frankly and critically presented to the contemplation of a developed or developing intelligence, contrast all this with the memories of the religious education they hitherto acquired in the home, in the church, or in the synagogue, and come to the conclusion that religion is a matter for children and the secular arts and sciences are alone worthy of serious consideration by those who have outgrown their childhood.

Our task, then, is not the futile endeavor to shield them against secular influences but to bring them into touch with religious teaching on the same plane of maturity and on the same high level of general culture as the secular studies in which they are now engaged.

In this religious conference, therefore, we are attempting through an accredited representative of each denomination represented on the campus to keep the young student in touch not only with the religious communion to which they belong but with scholars and clergymen of the various faiths who shall present religious problems to our young people in the spirit just alluded to. I am bound to state frankly that I believe that not every secretary engaged in religious work, or even every ordained minister, is quite fitted for this task. Unless our young people can meet men possessing a general education and culture at least equal to that of the average professor and with similar pedagogic qualifications for presenting the

case of religion to the modern young man and woman, we will fail in our task.

If, however, we can demonstrate to the student that the religious point of view makes its demand upon the mature heart and mind and not merely upon the infantile imagination and that it presents a view of life capable of integration with critical and scientific truths, we will have reached our goal. The science of today, by the way, is not at all inhospitable to religious thought. One has only to mention such names as Einstein, Miliken, Jeans, Edington, Halldane, Compton, and others of their ilk to realize that a strain of profound mysticism runs through the scientific speculations of today, pointing to a mysterious background in which space and time, matter and energy, seem to flow together. It is only when profound scientific thought is contrasted with a shallow and immature religiousness that religion loses its place of preëminence in the judgment of the modern mind.

It is possible, however, that under the auspices of a body such as this, educational work of a more positive character may be undertaken. Whether the University can be persuaded to give credits for the course or not, I believe it would be eminently worth while, both for the sake of advancing the co-operative spirit and enhancing the knowledge of spiritual influences involved in our American civilization, to organize a unified lecture course in the philosophy and discipline of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths, conducted by qualified representatives of these religious denominations.

I have in mind such a course as it was my privilege to participate in at Teachers' College of Columbia University. There were usually about sixty students of all denominations in attendance. For many years Father Ross, who was later connected with the School of Religion at Iowa University, gave the Catholic lectures, while Professor Adelaide Case, of Teachers' College, supervised the whole course and presented the Protestant's point of view.

These lectures were free from every tinge of propaganda. They were objective but sympathetic presentations of the great historical religions dominating the American scene and were presented by men with a thorough knowledge of the history, the doctrine, the practices of these various religions and with years of academic experience.

I believe that the students who attended these courses received a deeper insight into what Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish religion means to the intelligent and cultured adherents of these faiths than they could have attained through either one of these lecturers or through a course in comparative religions given by a purely secular authority. For the mere purpose of objective appraisal of these religions, the important thing is not to know what the Sacraments mean to a Protestant, or what the Reformation means to a Catholic, or what the Torah means to those who seek salvation on another path. We should all be eager to know what the Sacraments are and what they mean to a devout but cultured Catholic, what the Reformation means to a Protestant who still earnestly adheres to its pronouncements, and what the Torah means to the Jew who lovingly accepts it as his way of life. I believe that students who are interested in the religious life of America, and who have the tolerant outlook which Americanism implies, will be eager to study at first hand the various religious forces governing the life of our people and will, through that knowledge, place higher value upon the religious element in American life. The success of such a course will depend, I repeat again, upon the selections of such lecturers as are capable of and willing to present to a mixed audience a clear and intelligible account of the religion to which they give allegiance without seeking to compromise their particular position or to turn education into propaganda. Such a course, fostered by the religious communities on the campus of the University and main-

taining a high academic level, would, I am sure, meet with response from a considerable part of the student body and with sympathy on the part of the University authorities.

Furthermore, I believe that an even more ambitious program can be undertaken by a conference such as this. Though we stand committed to the conception of religion as something more than a vague religiosity, as implying the definite commitments inherent in the various creeds we represent, yet no thinking man can overlook the fact that all religious judgments are somehow based upon the conviction that the world of our experience involves spiritual as well as material reality.

In a purely materialistic universe no religious thought can find rational orientation and such a materialistic "Weltanschauung" would preclude religious truth and relegate religious values to the realm of fantasy and illusion. Now it is true that no materialistic philosophy has ever for long dominated the minds of men and we have already seen that the scientific speculations of today, since Einstein's explorations, are even in their restricted hypotheses less given to materialistic axioms than was the science of yesterday.

It is nevertheless true that the average young student is under the impression that science assumes a universe that is purely materialistic, whereas religion assumes the existence of a universe of quite a different type, and, though the student may pursue scientific investigation while holding nevertheless with more or less tenacity to certain religious doctrines, due to a saving of consistency in human nature, he feels a distinct cleavage in the springs and motives of his life which is not healthy for the individual and not promising for the future of religious thought.

Now, in the curricula of certain universities, depending largely upon who occupies the chair as head of the Department of Philosophy, there may be such courses offered as will submit to search-

ing and critical analysis the hypotheses of science and offer some basis for the integration of religious and moral aspiration with the factual elements in the world of nature. On the campus of this university there is an imposing structure called the Josiah Royce Hall, which perpetuates the name of a native Californian who occupied the chair of philosophy at Harvard University, on which faculty also appeared Professor William James. Both of these men, though differing in the formal aspects of their philosophies, presented a point of view with regard to life and the universe distinctly hospitable to religious thinking.

It seems to me, therefore, that the united religious forces of any community should establish a lectureship, wherever the University curriculum in philosophy does not suffice, to present not a complete metaphysic or even a philosophy of theism, but a searching analysis of modern scientific thought with the view of integrating it with the demands of any religious life whatsoever. For all religion posits existence of a reality transcending the tangible and visible and related to the essence of human personality. I have in mind the treatment of such questions as: Does physical causation preclude freedom? Have judgments of value and meaning objective validity? Does the theory of evolution preclude creative purpose as a feature of the universe?, and so on.

It is not the hypothesis of religion but the hypothesis of science which requires critical examination in order that it may find its rightful place, and be given only its rightful place, in the universe as envisaged by our young people. When once it is made clear that scientific method applies to one aspect of experience and that there are aspects of experience equally valid that point to realms beyond scientific investigation, we shall have done much to vindicate the sphere of religion in the world of modern culture.



---

## AN EXPERIMENT IN COOPERATION WITHIN A STATE UNIVERSITY

M. WILLARD LAMPE

THE word "experiment" still seems a natural description of our enterprise at the University of Iowa, although many well-wishers have congratulated us on being beyond that stage. At any rate, we try to retain a critical attitude toward what we are trying to do, and in presenting this paper, I shall attempt to give an honest appraisal of the three most characteristic features or trends of our undertaking.

(1) First of all,—first certainly from the viewpoint of its natural appeal to the popular imagination,—the School of Religion is a form of fellowship between many religious groups under the principle of "cooperation without compromise." That is to say, we have proceeded on the assumption that it is possible for the representatives of the various religious faiths which are found in this commonwealth to work together in a common cause,—the cause of an adequate presentation of the facts and nature of religion in a state university, and to do it in a spirit of complete sincerity and good will, with full freedom for each participant to teach and to live in accord with his own convictions and ideals.

The questions naturally arise,—How real has the fellowship been? Has the principle of "cooperation without com-

promise" been found to be practicable? As I think back over the relationships of the last five years I can recall many alterations and differences of opinion, but it has been a trail of widening and deepening friendship, without a single instance so far as I can recollect of anything suggesting personal animosity or estrangement. So far as my experience goes, our fellowship has been as genuine as that commonly found within any single religious group, and it has stood the test of daily association and the meeting of many unexpected and difficult problems.

The principle of "co-operation without compromise" has been interpreted to mean that we should co-operate only on those matters on which we can freely agree, and it applies especially to our common acceptance of the opportunity which has been offered to us to function as a regular unit of the University, together with the necessary rules and regulations which this involves. To me one of the most gratifying results of our association so far has been the general recognition on the campus and elsewhere that we do not stand for either a colorless or a synthetic religion, but rather for a free and complete expression of it, as it is actually adhered to and believed in by its living representatives today, tempered only by

the mutuality of friendship and the deep consciousness that we have much in common in spite of all our differences.

This spirit of our enterprise is proving contagious. Probably more than during any other year of American history, this past year has been marked by events of unusual significance in the sphere of Jew-Catholic-Protestant relationships. Mention should be made of the meeting of the National Conference of Jews and Christians, held in Washington in March, which was the climax of many local good will institutes which have been held during the past few years. Among those who participated in the Washington meeting were some of the most prominent leaders in American life, and the range of discussion covered not only the educational field but many other areas of common interest or conflict between the religious groups. It is fair to note, however, that while these good will meetings and permanent commissions on good will are fine, and are undoubtedly making a splendid contribution in the clarification of points of friction and the creation of better attitudes, it is a distinct step in advance to have, as we do here, a continuously functioning program which calls for co-operative counsel and daily association on a common problem, especially when that problem is as important as the curriculum of religion in a state university. It seems to me therefore that as a fellowship of religious faiths, operating under a standard of individual liberty, we are in line with social trends and have made measurable achievement.

(2) In the second place, the School of Religion is an organic part of the formal educational life of the University. It is a unit of the College of Liberal Arts, with the same fundamental rights and privileges as any other department. Indeed, it is more than a department; it has the status of a School with definite relationships to other departments of the University where cognate work is being done. Thus, in our own roster of courses, we regularly list, with the approval of the

departments concerned, selected courses in other units of the University, e. g., Child Welfare, Philosophy, School of Letters, and Dean Kay's course, "Geology and Man."

Special mention should be made of the relationship to the School of James C. Manry, professor of character education. A year ago a plan was adopted whereby the former Institute of Character Research was made a unit in the Child Welfare Research Station, with the understanding that the professor of character education should be available to teach on the undergraduate level in the School of Religion. One of the factors involved in this arrangement is the obvious desirability of a close relationship between the teaching of character education and religion. We therefore regard Professor Manry as a member of our undergraduate teaching staff, although like "all Gaul" he is really "divided into three parts," for he also belongs to Child Welfare and to Philosophy, and so far as the source of his salary is concerned, he belongs to these other two units exclusively. No member of the faculty is more active than he in the religious work of the campus or community.

This year we have had our best enrollment, the total for the last summer session being 47; for the first semester of 1931-32, 274; and the second semester, 229. I feel certain also that we have had our most satisfactory roster of courses. Our basic courses continue to be "The Religion of the Hebrews" and "The Life and Teaching of Jesus." So far as students with Jewish or Protestant backgrounds are concerned, it is felt that these two courses will usually serve as the best introduction to further study. However, each member of the faculty has given at least one new course this year, and in each case we feel that a real need has been met. These new courses have included a seminar on the "Approach to Student Problems"; "The Biographies of Modern Religious Leaders"; "The History and Principles of Christian Missions"; "The

"Living Religions of Mankind" (when-ever possible, in this course, a representative of the religion under discussion ad-dressed the class); and finally, a course in "Contemporary Religious Thought and Movements in America." These new courses are in line with one phase of our policy which we have had from the start, viz., a sufficient measure of experimen-tation to provide those courses which will best enable students to come to an understanding and appreciation of the historical values of religion and of its values as af-fected by the needs and thinking of today.

We are very conscious that we are still far from realizing the full opportunity which lies before us as one of the educational units of the university. We have not gone very far on the graduate level. Some students have taken their M. A. in Religion; none their Ph.D. It is our belief that our primary responsibility is in the undergraduate field, and that we should not attempt an extensive program of graduate study until we have a strong undergraduate base and a clear conception of those lines of graduate study lead-ing to the doctor's degree that might profitably be pursued here in view of our resources and the whole philosophy under-lying our enterprise. It is increasingly clear that one such line of graduate study might well be the whole subject of reli-gious work with students.

Other areas in which it is conceivable that our curricular work might be ex-tended are, first, the professional schools where practically nothing has been done, second, the freshman schedule, concern-ing which we already served notice that we are eager to enter as soon as certain difficulties can be overcome, and third, the Extension Courses where already we have made a beginning, in response to re-quests for this service. From the first year we have offered courses in the Sum-mer Session, and will do so again this coming summer, but it has been felt by many that we might well enlarge our summer program so as to include a one or two weeks' institute, attractively de-

signed to meet the needs of all types of religious leaders. These are samples of many dreams and proposals which have come to us for utilizing more fully the opportunity we enjoy as an integral part of this University.

Let me say a word about the attitude of members of the university faculty to-ward this venture. Many were enthu-siastic from the very start. Others have told me that we seemed to them to be a queer lot when we came five years ago. The presence of a Catholic priest, a Jew-ish rabbi, and a couple of Protestant min-isters as a part of the official life of a state university campus was a bit strange; and of course it was. One professor even announced before a large class that, on the very face of it, those connected with the School of Religion could not be sin-cere. And who will say he had no good reason for his opinion? Just how far we have dispelled such impressions, or to what extent we have been able to fit into the organic life of the University grace-fully and helpfully, I am unable to say, but I do know that during this past year more members of the faculty have gone out of their way to express an ap-preciation of what we are trying to do than ever before, and I have been amazed at the willingness of many of them to help in all sorts of ways, including the making of generous financial contribu-tions.

(3) The third distinguishing feature of the School of Religion is this: It is an active collaborator in all of the orga-nized religious life of the campus. This part of our work is apt to be obscured by our very name, "The School of Religion," which to many minds connotes only formal courses of study, the strictly curricular side of education. However, we have always conceived of our enter-prise in a much broader and deeper way than this. Our objective has been the supplementing and reinforcement of all character-building influences on this cam-pus. We have been concerned not merely with the study of religion but with assist-

ing students in every possible way to acquire an idealistic orientation toward life. We have given much attention therefore to extra-curricular activities, and to personal informal association with individuals and groups. These activities are our laboratory.

While this work devolves upon us all, a member of our faculty gives the major portion of his time to it. Let me mention, merely by way of illustration, two pieces of work which he has supervised during the past year in collaboration with many other participants. One was this. On four successive Wednesday evenings during Lent, each of twenty fraternities invited a professor to their house for supper, and following the supper the professor led the group in a fireside conversation about some phase of life's ideals. The reports from these meetings showed not only a genuine appreciation of these informal student-faculty relationships, but that in many cases there had been a frank and extended discussion of some of the most vital questions of student life. The second illustration is this. During the second week of April a Vocation Week was held, the purpose of which was to discuss in a very realistic way, and yet from the idealistic point of view, the whole question of choosing one's vocation under conditions such as prevail in the world at the present time. The religious groups brought their experts on this question, local talent was used, many regular class hours were devoted to various phases of the subject, while forums and personal interviews from early morning to late at night continued throughout the week. A check-up of the week's work showed many places where improvement could be made, but the consensus was that this was a very worth-while service that well might be repeated from year to year.

In addition to these special forms of united effort, there has been a continuous program of activity throughout the year. The Philo Club, for example, under the Jewish professor's leadership, assisted by Miss Helen Levitt during the first se-

mester, has had a very successful week-by-week program of personal guidance, social activity and Sunday night forums. Likewise, the many other student religious groups of the campus and the churches have had a busy year, and while we can take little or no credit for most of this work, our assistance has been freely given to the limit of our time and opportunity.

Much progress has been made during the year—more than during any preceding year—in co-ordinating all of this religious activity at the University of Iowa. This is apparent from the following statement of principles which was adopted a few weeks ago after extended deliberation by practically all of the professional religious leaders and active religious groups of the campus. The statement represents a further development of principles adopted in previous years, and especially a further development of the Commission on Religious Activities which the School of Religion brought into existence two years ago, when it was requested to promote the co-ordination of campus religious groups through some such device. The new statement is as follows:

PRINCIPLES FOR THE OPERATION OF THE COMMISSION ON RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

(1) That the Commission on Religious Activities be recognized as the cooperative unit through which all religious groups, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish and any others, shall clear the cooperative work, projecting such enterprises as carry the endorsement of the constituent groups.

(2) That the Inter-Church Committee be renamed, and recognized as the unit through which campus cooperative projects are cleared which are of interest to the Protestant groups as a whole.

(3) That the YMCA-YWCA be interpreted as one of the cooperating units in the Commission and, if they desire, in the Inter-Church Committee.

(4) That any group shall have the right to refrain from participating in any particular project. The possible need of special committees for specific projects shall be recognized where the above organizations would not cover all contingencies.

(5) That each of the above groups shall exercise its own administrative control. The School of Religion shall be related to the cooperative work of the units by naming the

Chairman of the Commission on Religious Activities, and the professor of applied religion shall be related to these groups as the individual groups may invite him.

(6) That in forming the Commission, the Newman Club and the Philo Club should be weighted two to one, and that direct representation be given to each of the Protestant groups, the YMCA, the YWCA, and other campus religious groups.

(7) That the office of the campus religious organizations be recognized as the geographical clearing-house for all groups.

(8) That the Council of Religious Workers continue primarily as an informal fellowship group.

These principles show that in this "laboratory" side of our work, as elsewhere, our underlying formula is "co-operation without compromise," and we have discovered that the formula permits us, in this extra-curricular field, to do many fine things together.

It is of course impossible to review all of our activities or discuss all of our problems. While we are compelled to say no to many requests which come to us, we try to hold ourselves in readiness to meet new opportunities in line with our purpose. For example, when a group of ministers in a near-by county suggested to one of our professors that we should plan a day of discussion and inspiration for them here in Iowa City, we were glad to do this, and out of it came an organization for additional gatherings of this kind. Moreover, we are glad to serve on many University and community committees, such as the Senate Board on Vespers, and on state and national organizations related to our fundamental interests. We are always willing to take the time to tell the story of the School of Religion to important groups of people

throughout the state: We are constantly profiting from constructive suggestions which come to us from many quarters, and we hope these friendly criticisms will continue.

A few days ago I overheard a spontaneous expression of one student to another which I think was the finest compliment for the School of Religion which has come to my attention. It was at the close of a class-hour and a little group of students were talking together not far from my desk where I was checking over the attendance record. This is the remark I heard: "The reason why the School of Religion works is because it is so fair." Of course I have no idea how many other remarks of a less complimentary nature have been made about our School, but it certainly was heartening to overhear this remark so spontaneously given. Just two months ago in New York State a law was enacted prohibiting all attempts, direct or indirect, to ascertain the religious affiliation of any applicant for a position in the public schools, on the ground that such information might work an injustice to the applicant. How much better is a situation like ours where one can stand for what he believes without fear or apology, where the atmosphere is conducive to mutual respect and trust so that one is anxious most of all to be fair to those who differ with him. At any rate, we will agree, I suspect, that when religion breathes the spirit of fairness, the way is wide open for such a school as ours to enrich the social and educational life of which it is a part.



---

## TRENDS IN THE RELATION OF EDUCATION AND RELIGION

LEWIS B. HILLIS

DR. GEORGE A. GORDON once said he wished to write a book entitled, "From Authority, Through Anarchy, To Insight."

Perhaps that sums up the historical tendency of education in relation to religion. In the early development of our country religion was the authority for education. Common schools, academies, colleges and universities were founded by the church or by the church and state together. To this day Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Amherst, Princeton, Columbia, and others too numerous to mention are affected by the early sanctions of the church.

Later education sought for academic freedom unhampered by authority. The child in the midst was the real authority. We have lately observed the progress through college of the first groups under the Montessori system. In his Charter Day address a few years ago, Dean Roscoe Pound spoke concerning the departure of authority from the universities, showing how the "facts of history," and the fundamental principles of law were alike affected by the discovery of the influence upon the thinking of the human

by glands, repressions, suppressions, complexes, and so forth. History does not consist of facts, but of records affected by men with glands, repressions, suppressions, complexes, and so forth. Hence it must be corrected by other men, likewise handicapped by the organs and thought patterns affecting our memory and judgment. So a five to four decision of the supreme court may not be a principle of law, but merely a gland or a complex in the system of the odd man. Authority, at least in education, seems to have given away to relativity. If you do not believe it, consult the grade curve.

Let us hope we are now approaching the period of insight, in which religion and education will cease fearing each other and co-operate. In short, the trend of religion and education is at present, and let us hope forever, to co-operate.

This is a reasonable tendency for many reasons. The trend of students is toward tax-supported institutions. Less than fifteen years ago the majority of the students of college grade were in independent institutions. The trend of denominational colleges is to become non-sectarian and for the non-sectarian institutions to

imitate, so far as possible, the universities. The trend of the universities seems to be toward increasing the emphasis upon religion. This may be due to several reasons. It is difficult to omit religion from some subjects. The origin of English literature is closely connected with the English Bible. Poetry, music and art are closely interwoven with religion. Ethnology is incomplete without a study of religion. Political science, economics, and history must consider the influence of religion, both ancient and modern.

Perhaps another reason for the tendency of education to revive its interest in religion is the amount of interest shown in religion by popular education, daily newspapers, radio, magazines, and sometimes movies. What interests 40 per cent of the population should be of interest to any tax-supported institution.

In his recent book *The U. S. Looks at its Churches*, Mr. C. Luther Fry has examined the significance of some interesting Census statistics in the following:

In the first place, the Census figures for 1926 bring out the magnitude of the church enterprise in this country. According to the latest returns there are 212 separate denominations having 232,000 churches and 44,380,000 members over 13 years of age. Denominational Sunday schools have an enrollment of more than 21,000,000 pupils, and even this figure excludes the pupils in undenominational Sunday schools and in parochial schools. The value of church edifices alone, not including such items as pastors' residences, investment property, school buildings, hospitals, etc., is reported as \$3,800,000,000, while for 1926 the total expenditure of local churches amounts to \$817,000,000. Such figures testify to the importance of the churches in American life.

Some measure of the vast dimension of organized religion in the United States can be formed by contrasting data for public schools with those for churches. The 232,000 churches compare with 256,000 public-school buildings. The total number of 21,000,000 Sunday school scholars is less by only 3,700,000 than the pupils in all the public elementary and secondary schools. The annual church expenditures of \$817,000,000 are 40 per cent as large as the expenditures of public schools. Clearly, organized religion is an enormous social enterprise.

And, further, "The total number of adult persons listed on the rolls of churches is about 55 per cent of the country's adult population. In other words,

about every other person belongs to a church."

The tendency of education has been to broaden the curriculum; to standardize the courses, the qualifications of teachers, and the requirements for admission; to form larger units under a unified administration. Here is a field of religion, comparatively unworked, which has recently been lifted to university standards by the introduction of literary, historical and even scientific methods of instruction in the departments of religious education. Religion is of human interest; it is taught in other educational institutions; it has had a profound influence upon the human race; it is exerting a deep and pervasive influence; it may be studied and taught by methods educationally accepted in a number of departments. In fact some departments cannot avoid the consideration of religions. The tendency of the university is to admit facts and adjust itself to new truth. For better or for worse, religion and education are inherently interrelated in their purpose, their processes, and their influence upon character. In fact, most of our religion is transmitted from one generation to another by educational processes, and therefore the quality of our religion is dependent upon education. The broadened program of the university should embrace religion in order to keep its perspective.

Some say "Religion can be lived, but not taught." In answer Dean Herbert E. Hawkes says:

Teaching does not consist in cramming a student's mind with information; it consists in making the student want to read deeply, to think clearly, and to see the bearing of his subject in the world of vital ideas. Real teaching stimulates, but does not satisfy. With this definition of teaching I submit that religion is as legitimate a field for collegiate teaching as any subject in our curriculum. . . . The analogy between instruction in religion and in the fine arts is a close one. The aesthetic and the religious are two aspects of the human spirit that actually exist, and that ought to be discussed, studied and developed. Thirty years ago we used to hear that the aesthetic side of our nature was not a proper subject for collegiate study. Art could be felt and practiced, but not

taught, they said. But today an understanding of the nature and development of the beautiful through the media of painting, sculpture and architecture, music and literature leads our students by the hundreds to an appreciation of the beautiful in their own souls. In organizing the study of religion for college students it is necessary to start back . . . with the factual material of history, of society and human nature, as a solid rock on which the study of religion may be based.

Dr. George A. Gordon wished to write a book entitled "From Authority, Through Anarchy, To Insight." Our young people have certainly emerged from the age of authority, either paternal, social, or divine. Each is a master of his own destiny in an anarchy of individualism. It is time for someone to clear the way for the next step, which is insight.

The trend toward co-operation between religion and education is reasonable and logical because religion often has separated men; it has made men suspicious of others holding a strange religion; it has caused wars. The world is growing too small for men to have useless barriers between them. Just as in the Grecian and Roman civilizations, local deities were assembled in a pantheon and assigned varied values, so now the gods of nations are passing in review before a world eager for regeneration, a sad, sinful, bewildered world, religiously wistful, seeking to know the true God, to cry unto Him and from Him to receive forgiveness and strength to go forward. Religion and education must co-operate to help the world find the true religion and the true education.

Whitelaw Reid, in an address before Stanford University on the "University Tendencies in America," asks what defects of human character does a republic tend to develop that higher education should correct? He answers that we are narrow, conceited, slow to believe that others can teach us anything. We worship hurry, bigness, excitement, wholesale production, and we level down, pare off individualism in character and action, resent and pull down superiority, encourage mediocrity, and try to avow that

mediocrity is equal to the best and just as good. Can democracy persist without religion?

Democracy, education and religion are in a state of flux. Education needs religion to help make democracy safe for the world. And religion needs education to exist in a democracy. Democracy needs both education and religion to continue to exist. It has failed in the past, and so have many types of religion. More religion in education and more education in religion will harm few of us.

#### I. TRENDS IN STATEMENT AND INTERPRETATION OF CONSTITUTION AND LAWS.

##### A. United States Constitution.

###### Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their *Creator* with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. . . We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America in general Congress assembled, appealing to the *Supreme Judge* of the world for the rectitude of our intentions. . . And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of *Divine Providence*, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our *sacred honor*.

Constitution—Article II, Clause 7: (Oath) Before he enters on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

(Note: The exception was not for infidels, but for religious men—Quakers.)

Furthermore, the First Amendment, sometimes cited as a reason for the inability of the schools to give instruction in religion, is difficult to understand in all its implications:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for redress of grievances.

Under that statement has Congress a right to hinder a student from studying

religion in a school? How can a man have freedom of religious belief when he is religiously illiterate? Whether or not this amendment has been nullified is perhaps a debatable question.

*B. State Constitutions and laws.*

It was in the spirit of loyalty to the principle of religious freedom and toleration as expressed in this amendment that the states sought to prohibit sectarian influences in the public schools by legislation and constitutional provisions. . . . An examination of these provisions will likewise show that, on the whole, they are meant to prohibit sectarian influence and propaganda and not religious teaching. The provisions on the statute books of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Utah, however, are against "the teaching of sectarian or religious doctrines" . . . The emphasis here is also on "doctrine" and therefore it seems clear that its spirit is also anti-sectarian rather than anti-religious.<sup>1</sup>

After a careful examination of the Supreme Court decisions of the various states, Mr. Searles concludes:

An examination of these state supreme court decisions will show that with one exception every case which has been before the courts has had to do with the public school system below the college and university, and that, as we have pointed out, these have largely centered around the matter of the reading of the Bible. In no case has the question ever arisen in the courts in regard to the non-sectarian scholarly study of religion as it is being carried on in state universities. The conclusion is then, that the study of religion is in conflict with no constitutional provisions with the possible exceptions of those of Arizona, Utah, and Washington, and reference to the curricula of the state universities in these states will show that they all are offering courses in the scientific study and interpretation of religion.

California State Constitution, 1879, Article IX, Sec. 8: "Nor shall any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught, or instruction thereon be permitted directly or indirectly in any of the common schools of this state."

California Pol. Code. 1906, Sec. 1672: "No publication of a sectarian, partisan, or denominational character must be used or distributed in any school or be made a part of any school library, nor must any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught therein."

1. Herbert Leon Searles, *The Study of Religion in State Universities*, University of Iowa Studies in Character, 1927, Iowa City, Iowa.

California—Evans vs. Selma Union High School District 1924. It is held that the fact that the King James version has not been accepted by all does not class it as sectarian. The statute makes "the character of the book the test of whether it is sectarian; not the authorship or the extent of its approval by different sects or by all." The King James or the Douai Version or both might well be purchased. . . . Pol. Code Sec. 1607 makes it the duty of boards of education and school trustees "To exclude from schools and school libraries all books, publications, or papers of a sectarian, partisan or denominational character."

California Constitution, Art. IX, Sec. 9: "The University of California . . . shall be entirely independent of all political or sectarian influence." Just how this is to be accomplished is not clearly indicated, inasmuch as the organic act of the university provides that a majority of the board of control shall never be of the same sect, nor of no sect. Without sects only a minority of the regents would be eligible. Quite evidently the purpose in the minds of the legislators was to protect the religious freedom of the university, while freeing it from sectarian domination. Indeed, it is quite possible that this may have been one of the conditions upon which the College of California was given to the state, for provision was also made that the university should continue to teach the liberal arts.

\* \* \*

*C. Summary.*

The first amendment to the Constitution seems to provide free exercise of religion. Religious curiosity has a right to be exercised in study.

The laws, constitutions and supreme court decisions of the various states seem to be aimed at sectarian doctrine and propaganda. Even the states which seem to prohibit teaching of religion are offering courses in religion in their state universities.

## II. TRENDS IN CURRICULA

Though no up-to-date survey has been made in this field, the studies made by Prof. Charles F. Kent in 1923-1924 do provide a flashlight picture at that time.<sup>2</sup> It is to be recognized, furthermore, that since 1924 the trend toward more courses in and tangent to "Religion" are being offered.

The aim of this survey is to show to what extent religion is taught in regularly accredited undergraduate courses in the tax-supported colleges and universities of the United States and how far these institutions during the academic year 1922-23 were able in practice to meet the students' need for systematic instruction in religion. The survey is based on the courses offered and elected during that year.

Theoretically these institutions are not supposed to teach religion, and in the main they do not, but gradually courses, religious and semi-religious, are beginning to permeate their curricula.

The forces behind this broad movement are many and varied. Primary, perhaps, is the desire to remove the stigma of godlessness with which the state colleges and universities have been branded. More potent still is the desire of their administrative officers to fill the serious gap in every curriculum where religion is not taught. Sometimes the students or their parents demand that certain religious courses be given. Many individual courses are offered because of the personal interest of presidents, deans or instructors. Public opinion, often more effective than law, supports these courses, and they are increasing rather than waning. In several institutions the offerings in 1923-24 are much richer than in 1922-23.

The survey includes all of the one hundred and eighty-one tax supported institutions in the United States that offer four years of work of college grade and have the authority to grant degrees. Complete information is given regarding one hundred and fifty-seven, partial regarding twenty, and none regarding four, whose catalogues could not be secured.

Of the fifty-four state universities and the state colleges for women, complete data was given for forty-six and partial data for eight. Only five universities offered no courses in religion in 1922-23: The University of Georgia, the University of Idaho, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mining College, New Mexico University, and the University of Wyoming.

Three universities were listed as offer-

2. Charles Foster Kent, *The Undergraduate Courses in Religion at the Tax-supported Colleges and Universities of America*.

ing courses in religion which were not given in 1922-23: University of Arizona, University of Arkansas and the University of North Carolina.

Of the seventy state teachers' colleges reporting, forty-five offer no courses in religion. One offers a course in the English Bible which was not given in 1922-23; another a course in the Reformation which was not given.<sup>3</sup>

Of the forty-one State Colleges of Agriculture, Engineering, Mines, Medicine (not graduate schools) and State Military Colleges, thirty-two were found to offer no courses in religion. Nine gave courses.

Three of the eight Municipal Universities and Colleges offered no courses in religion.

Of the four institutions supported by the Federal Government, three offered no courses, but of the three, two have chaplains, chapels and services.

\* \* \*

Summary: Of the one hundred and eighty institutions studied, ninety-six offered courses in religion; but of the fifty-four state universities and state colleges for women, only five universities offered no courses in religion.

## III. TRENDS IN ORGANIZATIONAL FORMATION.

Several types of organizations are in operation:

## A. Local.

1. Schools of Religion.<sup>4</sup>

- (a) The University of Illinois Foundations (a brief body of conditions and standards). Ph. D., or equivalent, for teachers.
- (b) The Kansas School of Religion. A. B. and B. D. or equivalent.
- (c) Ohio Union School of Religion. University pastors. No connection with the university.
- (d) The Association of Religious Teachers at the University of

3. Bulletin IV of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education. Pp. 18-19.

4. Credit is allowed for work done by all these Schools of Religion in the institutions where they are located.

Texas. Teachers, courses and standards acceptable to the university.

- (e) School of Religion at the University of Oklahoma.
- (f) Wesley School of Religion. Courses published in the annual catalogue under the heading of Religion at the University of North Dakota.
- (g) Bible College of Missouri. Practically a union affair since 1914.
- (h) School of Religion, University of Montana. Credit given.
- (i) School of Religion at the University of Iowa. Latest and most carefully organized. A part of the university, but supported by churches.

2. Departments of Religion, or Chairs of Religion, are operating in some other institutions, such as Oklahoma College of Agriculture and Mining.

*B. National.*

1. Council of Church Boards of Education. For several years this organization has maintained a university committee, with a full time secretary in charge. This committee for years, with Dr. M. Willard Lampe as chairman, and Dr. O. D. Foster as secretary, has exercised a strong influence upon interdenominational and interfaith approaches to the universities of this country.
2. National Council of Religion in Higher Education. So interesting has been the development of these schools of religion that in 1922 a group of leaders, under the direction of Dr. Charles Foster Kent, organized the National Council of Schools of Religion, later becoming The National Council on Religion in Higher Education. To this body we have been indebted for the sur-

veys of the curricula of state institutions.

From Professor Kent's earlier more comprehensive aspirations the Council has become more highly specialized in training—by establishment of national fellowships—most promising students for positions in the field of religion, broadly interpreted.

3. The Religious Education Association has recently asked Dr. O. D. Foster to organize a North American Conference upon Religion in Higher Education, as a research study, survey, and fact-finding agency, taking into consideration the viewpoints, interests, and programs of Jews, Catholics, and Protestants. This Conference has been organized and has in its membership many of the very highest authorities, Catholic, Jewish, Protestant and state education.

*C. Summary.*

Organizations of varying types, but of similar purpose, and programs are in successful operation in several parts of the country. National organizations are assisting in the exchange of experiences, standardization of courses, and preparations of leaders.

**IV. TRENDS IN PLANNING.**

The trend seems to be clearly toward co-operation of church and state in religious education. This trend is affected by the fear of administrators that criticism may come either from sects or taxpayers. The future of religion in education does not depend so much upon the administrations as it does upon the representatives of religion. No administration wishes to stir up an injunction suit, or to have a sect try to dictate to a university what it shall teach. Obviously, the first step in the solution of the problem of a proper and gradual development in the study of religion is a better understanding between sects and faiths. Such conferences as this contribute to that end.

Such schools of religion as are operating in various parts of the country should be teaching us to work together for the cause of religion as a whole. We all believe in the ten commandments. We all believe in loving our God with all our heart, all our mind, and all our might, and our neighbor as ourself. We all believe in doing all we can to co-operate with God in bringing the life more abundant to his children. We all accept the scriptures of the Old Testament, in our various versions. We all believe the teachings of Christ are of great value. We all believe that our great problem is in the bringing up our own children in the nurture and admonition of God; and that everything our neighbor does to bring up his children according to the teachings of God helps us; and everything we do to make our own children God-fearing helps our neighbors. There is strife enough in the world and hatred, and envy, and suspicion, and doubt. Religion should teach God's children to dwell in peace, joy, love, and service, having life more abundantly.

What have we to fear in the finding of truth? It is not inconceivable that

truth can injure real religion. Can religion injure education?

\* \* \*

#### SUMMARY.

1. Neither national or state constitutions, nor laws prevent credit being given by tax-supported institutions for courses in Religion.

2. Such courses are actually being taught and credited in nearly one hundred of the leading tax-supported institutions in this country.

3. Organizations, both local and national, have been formed to assist the state and church to work out a satisfactory program of religious education.

These are facts which seem to show not only a possibility, but a necessity for careful consideration of the future of such education in religion.

4. Planning—but planning tempered with the spirit of genuine co-operation between churchmen of the different sects and faiths—for a combination of the best programs developed at the present time in our state universities, of which the University of Iowa seems at present to be the most ideal.

\* \* \*



## TOWARD A THEORY OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AT STATE UNIVERSITIES

EDWARD W. BLAKEMAN

RELIGION, being an ancient experience, claims a large place in most of the universities of the world. In fact, it was because the religious thesis occupied too large a part in the training of colonial times that Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, among others, appeared as early proponents of a new sort of education. That religion as a field of study should ever be out-distanced by mathematics or economics or physics was beyond their imagination. The inference was rather that the church (energetic custodian of faith and promoter of schools and colleges) would always see to it that wherever her children assembled there religion would be central in the series of subjects being taught.

The spectacle of a commonwealth, such as Ohio, having the majority of its youth in one vicinity, such as Columbus, studying every subject except religion, while religion (as understood by the church) is taught in a privately endowed college in various places remote would be a startling fact to Jefferson or Franklin should they walk again among the institutions of America. In other words, it is not for the "Church Workers in State Universities" to explain why we aim to bring re-

ligion and the church to the state campus, but it is rather for the boards of education of our great church bodies to explain why in Wisconsin the educational investment of such boards is in Appleton and Beloit rather than in Madison, to explain why in Illinois their investment is in Galesburg and Bloomington rather than in Urbana, —to explain why in Michigan the church investments are chiefly in Albion and Olivet and not in Ann Arbor.

Something has gone wrong; the major groups in general education are in one place; religious education is in another. Such a division of the field, whether accidental or premeditated, can promise only impotency.

### 1. THE INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

It therefore devolves upon us to deal with the ownership complex which now distresses higher education. We say distresses because both the State and the Church are suffering. If we go back to the initial situations we find that in Middle Atlantic States and the Northwest territory this maladjustment began rather early.

The churches, tenacious for the fully rounded curriculum, over-anxious to keep

the New Testament central and hoping to buttress the religion of Jesus with classical influence had had success with private or semi-public church colleges such as Harvard, Yale, Princeton. Hence the churches kept steadily forward with such education. While doing so, many other phases of the developing nation were overlooked by them. Instead of making a studious and statesmanlike analysis in the central west of the reasons for the growing popularity of public education, of which the state universities came to be the crowning achievement, both branches of our American Christianity set their wills to produce an educated electorate which would also be a religious electorate. The Roman Catholic Church, with a consistency which is characteristic of their leaders, centered attention on the child. Investment in parochial schools was their contribution. For years the high school, college, and the university ranges of education were ignored by the Catholic scheme of education.

Protestant denominations, on the other hand, with less consistency, fell in love with the public schools, or professed to have done so,—threw to their children a substitute religious education in the form of voluntary Sunday schools, and riveted the attention of ablest denominational leaders upon the college range of education. Church colleges in many states was the result. What the Catholics did in the grades we Protestants did in our colleges. We duplicated the educational system in each Western State. Both systems, Catholic and Protestant, are parochial. Both are anti-social in effect though neither was so intended. Like Topsy, these systems "just growed." To be sure the principle at bottom was a sound one, namely: These Christian people, both Catholic and Protestant, fixed their gaze

on educational unity, with God as a central concept. The promoters of state education, influenced from the start by Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, and directed, more than even the fondest biographer has even dared to claim, by the venturesome prophetic theories of Horace Mann, focused on educational unity with man not God as the central concept. And here we are in 1932 chastened by adversity, trying to harmonize the two concepts and bring power to a discouraged, jaded, and disillusioned American electorate.

What, then, is the psychological situation? For us as churchmen it may be stated thus:

The Christian colleges are *ours*, but the universities are *theirs*. This half-truth must be faced within each coherent group of Christians. The Congregationalists, Baptists, Catholic, Methodist, etc., around the whole circuit of churches, must be convinced speedily that the

What constitutes education in religion? Is knowledge of religion essential to a state? Dare the states conducting universities omit religion? Is not sectarianism a minor negative while religion is a major positive element?

State University is owned by us just as definitely as the church colleges are owned by us. Three facts must be appraised: (1) In these mid-western and the far-western states the state universities and colleges are the determining factors in higher education. There are but three independent or church universities west of Chicago. There are a score of colleges that set out with charters to become universities. In the competition our denominations do not merely stand to lose. They have already become secondary. The financial resources are with our states. Since steady income alone can enable an institution to carry the superior scholars on the payroll, the educational future must rest with the states. Our church colleges are constantly being pulled to higher and higher academic levels by the competition of

state institutions. Larger and larger budgets are necessary and the churches can no longer supply the funds. As a result, state education already dominates the entire Western portion of the United States. If the church portion of a state population hopes to influence the future through education, it will be necessary for the church educators to court favor and entertain alliance with the universities of the state origin. (2) Where are our students enrolled? In every state university there are enrolled more Methodists than attend the Methodist colleges of that state, more Lutherans than attend the nearby Lutheran institution; and more Roman Catholics than are enrolled at the Catholic college of the state concerned. The only saving fact in the situation to me seems to be that these students from our altars but enrolled in state schools are as much *ours* as the ones who study at a college where the church owns the campus and where ecclesiastical bodies exercise a partial control in the selection of the faculty. (3) For the church people to repudiate the civic university which rides into leadership on taxes toward which we all pay, is to refuse to accept the commodity which we have already purchased. The statement that the state university is *theirs*, not *ours*, is a misnomer. The civic institution is *ours*. Therefore, we come to a new day,—a day in which we admit that in our colleges we own an educational system which is very expensive and but partly a success. Also we see that we are part owners in a larger, and more economical educational system. However, we have not yet learned to appreciate our part in the state system of education, much less to admit its economy. It therefore becomes necessary to merge these two systems, the church system, and the state system; so that without doing violence to the Constitutional separateness of Church and State the benefits of both educations may be made available for each student group.

## II. THE EDUCATIONAL ISSUE

Turning from the ownership phases of the problem, as it affects the church boards and the trustees and faculties of colleges, let us examine our state universities. Let us move away from the founders and owners of institutions and inquire into education itself. Let us ask about general education which, as many would have it, is supposed to exclude that which religious education is to include. Is education with religion minimized a simple matter? Has separation of Church and State opened any additional issues? Allow us to bring out by questions a few of the various problems that seem to be involved. What is a state University? Does not the name "University" mean something altogether inclusive? It was John Newman who said, "I would have a university in which any student could pursue any subject in the experience of the race." In "History, Vol. II," Dr. Samuel Johnson declared: "The University of Paris was first to be called a university because it was first to embrace all the arts."

Can a State University be a university? Can the state enter the field of religion? My answer would be,—it has entered the field of religion. The real question before us is rather, "has it done so without becoming sectarian?" The question of religion as a curriculum matter in a state university hinges not on religion, but on the sectarianism involved. Can the university enter into the teaching of religion? If the institution itself can attempt it, then denominationalism will be reduced to the minimum. Also, religion will get a treatment as scientific as that given other fields of life. Perhaps it will receive a treatment as fair as it gets at the hands of our historic religious bodies. For me, I am quite certain that, at this point, we of the church have long been doubting the very allies in whom we should be most trustful. I believe that universities are steadily becoming competent to deal with each problem which

presents itself. Two questions, the very asking of which clears, the air, may be considered; viz:

#### A. RELIGION: A PHASE OF CULTURE

(1) Is not religion universal and, therefore, above sectarianism? Such was the assumption in America in the beginning. The states were united into a United States on the fundamental assumption that "freedom of conscience" in matters of religion and "freedom to govern ourselves" were companion axioms. On the former, we erected the American church, on the latter, the American state. Those wise statesmen of our first national bodies held clearly in mind the fact that the people constitute a single social unit. This unit, for convenience, functions in two ways, namely, at one time we function religiously, and at another time we function civically. Or, to be more explicit, we are always the same people, but we *organize* ourselves in one way for a spiritual or religious expression, and we organize ourselves another way for order or a civic expression. The *unity* is the essential thing we have in mind. So long as we make this fact central in all of our thinking, we shall be free from any fear that the state will determine church, or church control state, or that, in the final analysis, either will stifle the other.

(2) Must the various functions of a state be considered apart from religion? Can they be thoroughly studied at all without crossing and recrossing the field of religion? Has the state or nation even the slightest chance to understand itself without also knowing the citizens spiritually and without having a grasp of the religion which either beautifies or makes ugly the lives of particular individuals and of groups within the state? That is,—

Can a university (state or private) keep off the field of religion and be a university? If it can, then religion would seem to be an isolated aspect of society. We do not so view it. On the other hand, if it

cannot keep off the field it should be allowed full freedom to move untrammelled, not only over civic and other general subjects, but also over religious subjects. Every university should move at will among the institutions called religious bodies and weigh all values, including those of the spirit. For those of us who trust education there is no fear at this point. Christianity and other great religions will survive on merit. We would hold that more freedom, not less, will aid religion. We would go further and hold that in order that the university may get at the truth, it must call upon the religious groups, at least for certain historic data in religion and for those methods known as church life and policy.

The University then, if it desires to do so, can go far in the matter of enriching the curricula.

#### B. A SOLUTION BY ENRICHMENT

There is reason to congratulate independent universities, such as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Chicago, and Stanford, for they stand unaffected. On one side are the church colleges, with a fully rounded curriculum, but a vain struggle with financial problems. On the other side are the state universities, freed in a large measure from the fear of starvation, but put to it to bring into their departmental life those courses admittedly of deepest significance to the modern state.

The state universities, it must be observed, developed as any normal social activity; necessity rather than logic shaped events. Even the oldest one (Michigan, whose academy began in 1817 and college in 1837) has as yet failed adequately to present religion. Every state institution functions awkwardly when efforts are made *adequately to inspire* or challenge the spirit and moves haltingly in efforts designed to round out the personality. If we glance at state universities and state colleges that are younger, such as Iowa or Oregon and ask about courses, we observe that the central curriculum is made up of agricultural, economic, and engi-

neering branches. But there are courses in literature, history, and philosophy. These cultural courses have been put under the superstructure, as it were, after the building itself had been shaped and set on posts. The original posts so used were biology, mathematics, economics, and physics.

There should be no disappointment, therefore, when we discover that religion is one of the departments of the state university last to arrive. It is well for us as churchmen to observe that there are two reasons for this, not one. First, religion will arrive late because it is one of the arts, and secondly it will arrive late because of constitutional restrictions. In other words, just as literature was brought in because English is essential to convey ideas about physical sciences, and just as sociology was brought in because a knowledge of group-relations is indispensable for students who are trying to grasp economics, so religion is now being drawn into the State curriculum by the very necessity of religion being known before history can be mastered or the political behavior of peoples in the far east can be appreciated. Eventually, religion—in spite of legislative precautions, it would seem—is destined to become a conspicuous part of every university. Mere governmental guards against the incidental sectarianism now inherent in divergent ecclesiastical systems, will never prevent our universities from rounding out their departments.

What justification have we for this rather bold prediction in a nation which boasts of religious freedom and thinks of the separation of Church and State as one of the guarantees of our liberties? Furthermore, why do we in this decade which witnesses the fall of the Church in Spain, a more definite separation in Italy, an utter repudiation of the church in Russia, a curtailment of the clergy in all the Latin American countries, and the sweeping exclusion of religious instruction from the high schools and colleges of old China? The answer is this: Religion has broken

her prison bars. She is refusing to remain within ecclesiastical organizations. As an ally of freedom religion is again in the courtyard ready to go on the march and willing to strike new alliances for her adventure. Religion too long imprisoned behind the discipline groups and set in systems of thought which seem to have out-lived their usefulness, has leaped into freedom. In America many people now witnessed the religious spirit not in houses of worship alone but in social charity, not in Bible reading but in creative enterprises of community life, not in church activity but in the social movements of youth, in health crusades and in strange experimental laboratories, some social, some natural science, and some mechanical. Only those who have read history come close to the throbbing desires of needy people, felt the shattering of quaint structures, or seen the overthrow of old usages, can understand and go on unafraid. Religion, in our decade, is getting genuine reconsideration. Religion is not only a warm theme in the forums of mankind,—it is a glowing center in the secret aspirations of the youth of our time. It does not require a prophet to predict that within another generation the Supreme Court of many a state, and perhaps of our United States, will be called upon to re-define the major theses relating to religious education namely: What constitutes education in religion? Is knowledge of religion essential to a state? Dare the states conducting universities omit religion? Is not sectarianism a minor or negative while religion is a major positive element?

Dealing specifically with our immediate problem, what evidence have we that religion is coming to a definite place within state universities? A study of the Wisconsin curriculum compared with that of Yale, and of the California curriculum with Harvard reveals the facts. We discover, in the main, that religion as presented at Harvard is *grouped* and labeled religion; but in the University of California courses in religion are not grouped,

but are *scattered*. For example, in Harvard, Comparative Religion and History of Religions are under a Department of Religion. In California the data involved are offered partly in the department of Oriental Languages and Literature, and partly as Philosophy. If we turn to other phases of religion, we find much of the material called religion at Yale or Harvard reaches the state student by way of ethics, sociology, or history. In like fashion, nearly one-half of all the basic courses offered in Yale as religious education are served to the student at Wisconsin through the Department of Education. The same is true of the languages. In Yale or Harvard, ancient languages dovetail with research, excavations, and lectures in religion until to the non-critical observer all of these courses seem to be religion in Yale or Harvard and none of them seems to constitute religion in Wisconsin or California. At the University of California last year, a scholar gave the research lecture of the year upon "The Internal Problems of the Book of Isaiah." This research was initiated not by a department or a professor of religion, but by the Semitics Department. This lecture on a biblical subject was accorded, by the State University, the highest honor of the year. One might go on and on to illustrate that religion as a curricula matter is finding its way into the State University.

#### C. TO HASTEN THE PROCESS

How hasten this evolutionary process? By providing through the office of the president or dean a method by which four changes, each of which are in the line with present trends may take place, viz: (1) the curriculum courses which carry religion content may be grouped and announced, (2) on the basis of regular courses in the Independent University enter into conference with men in religious education and provide supplementary teaching with credit. This could be done on an affiliation basis, (3) provide

a faculty committee to study and re-study the curriculum so as to encourage the teaching of religion and constantly eliminate sectarianism, and (4) insist that foundations and guilds and special university priests or rabbis or pastors like ambassadors from one country to another shall be received by the University administration before such functionaries assume freedom at the campus.

But turn now to the extra-curricula phase of our state universities. What is going on there?

#### D. CAMPUS CHANGES

This question relates to the Christian Association widely used at practically all State Universities. If the Young Men's and the Young Women's Christian Associations, long looked upon as adequate to quicken parts of Protestantism into unity, no longer seem to hold the allegiance of the majority of students, is it not because the functions once performed by them have been assumed by student agencies that are closer to the administration?

The Student Unions have come to take over the whole assembly, recreation, and lobby life of the students, a point at which the early Association secretaries functioned to wholesome purpose. The student self-government organizations have taken over a score of services once performed with a character implication by the student Y. M. and Y. W. These include the handbook, employment, rooming accommodations, lectures on occupations, voluntary tournaments, delegations sent to high schools, service clubs and alumni groups, and rallies which introduce professors and coaches to the general group of freshmen. Also orientation courses and matriculation care of students have come to warm the entire university life. One's first thought is that the university community has banished the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. Reflection, however, leads one to command the Association for having been creative in education. That is, extra-curricula interests in our univer-

1. Professor William J. Popper.

sities have moved in the direction of social service. And classroom lectures have become campus projects, that is, humanitarian religion has moved into the State University and become an intimate characteristic of each University administration.

Therefore, at the end of the first twenty years of the University Pastor Movement, and of the first forty years of the Christian Associations, we see two trends, namely a trend toward the teaching of religion subjects by the universities of the state, and a trend toward the conscious practice of humanitarian religion by these universities.

### III. THE CHARACTER ISSUE

Another phase which needs treatment is that of direct contact, adjustment, and the questions which relate to personal integration. Guidance or student counselling for specific spiritual purpose is important. It was Prof. William E. Hocking who said, "If I were to name the chief defect of contemporary education, it would be that it produces so many stunted wills, wills prematurely grey, and incapable of greatness, not because of lack of endowment, but because they have never been searchingly exposed to what is noble, generous and faith provoking." Does this not touch the central issue? It is the major challenge before us teachers of religion. Prof. Luther Weigle comes to grips with a similar issue, as follows: "The contrast and opposition between experience and ideals, between facts and values, between what is and what ought to be, constitute the fundamental problem of education." Now, to accept this general philosophy as we approach the state universities to teach religion, each University Pastor deals with these opposing factors as does every other educator.

He must be a master of theory, have intrinsic merit as a student, possess a personality, and enjoy the experience of intellectual achievement. Here then, is his vital relation; his test of effectiveness.

It is just here that religious education should become education at its best. It is in the realm of synthesis that the counselor finds his right to exist. It is because of the interplay of forces behind and objectives before, that the work is significant. The successful functioning of religion after this fashion at any campus will strengthen the state university at its weakest point. Mere mention of this service, however, brings to mind a sad paradox of our American religious existence. In proposing religion do we not propose the most dynamic of all forces, the most liberating of all releases, the most original of all creativities? And yet, our formal and outward organized American Christianity belies the very word dynamic, often substitutes restrictions for release and prescribes sameness where the diagnosis calls for originality.

One comes out of the fog of such a dilemma feeling confused, but impelled to quote those strong passages which are central to religious faith. "Thy gentleness has made me Great." "Out of weakness hath he ordained strength"; as for the religious person who is capable of abundant living. He is often performing these all-important services of adjustment by indirection. If he possesses the charm and has the power to perform this function as a daily concern within a state university which is at once a cross-section of the entire people and a free community, he is then complementing the education of a State. Now the Boards of Education of the various religious bodies—seeking to lift campus religious education above the traditionalism of a community church,—are naming men and women supposedly of peculiar skill, as campus representatives. Thus the student interest has a chance to register and each University within itself is called upon to develop its own peculiar spiritual power. However, co-ordination is essential and co-ordination in two directions—first with the faculty, and then with other campus pastors.

### B. A FUNCTION BASIS

In every American student center, university pastors, counselors, and secretaries of associations should be selected on the basis of *function* rather than on the basis of *affiliation*. That is, each religious worker should have a task to perform for the *whole student group* along a *given line*, worship, or counseling, or foreign students, or Bible teaching, or social leadership. We must speedily rise to such a unity at every campus. To do this, each must cease taking all his orders from the adult local church or solely from a denominational educational board. When unity is once established at the campus, pastoral work at the Presbyterian center, or conduct of worship at an Episcopal edifice, will serve the particular constituency without detracting from the whole. Our counseling, our teaching, our social life, our directing of student enterprises, and our educational engineering in behalf of religion should all be directed and carried forward on an *educational basis*. An attempt at unity should be the central notion. Jews and Christians are in a wholesome effort to discover a basis of good will. The Catholics are unified. Our initial demand is that the executives for Protestants cease developing independent programs, and without neglecting distinctive contributions of each group *work unitedly*. Executive leadership should be centralized. When the central executive headquarters, supported by a thoroughly representative lay board of trustees, is given administrative power to direct the work at a given campus, and

only when this becomes a fact, are we to be able to adequately understand the whole student population, make use of our present facilities or perform any lasting service for the non-religious students. Not until we are unified in plan and become frankly aware of our various differences will we cease laboring in vain.

### CONCLUSION

It would seem, therefore, that religion as a field of learning is slowly but steadily making its way within our state universities, that our church colleges face defeat in the race for leadership in education in the western states, that humanitarian religion is becoming a normal function within the state institutions, that the parish and denominational approach of religious education tends to defeat its own purpose, but a co-operative staff so composed that the university pastors may function each in a limited field for a general constituency, rather than serve the members of a given group, would strengthen all and that a complete recast of our boards of trustees and methods of control, will be essential, if we accord to Jew, to Catholic, to Protestant, and to the non-religious within the university, or even within the university community, that freedom and fraternity which both religion and culture impose.

Finally, we must adopt thoroughgoing educational objectives if we are to complement the state university, rise to our opportunity of strengthening this great system at its weakest point, and thereby give religion its chance among the youth of tomorrow.



### Confusion in Religious Education

To the Editor: I should like to occupy most of the space in this Forum comment in commendation of your stimulating and provoking symposium on "Sin and Salvation in an Age of Science and Machinery." This method of presenting varying views on any given subject seems to accomplish for the magazine what the "V" or "U" Table or Panel does for Conferences. Your Panel was exceedingly well chosen and performed in a convincing and scholarly manner.

I wish to devote my attention primarily, however, to another article written jointly by M. L. Smith and J. E. Bathurst entitled, "Tests and Measurements in Religious Education." A title so suggestive of Doctor Watson's book of similar caption written five years ago aroused in me an expectancy for advanced and more recent contributions to this subject. This does not seem to be the case. From the very outset the issues seem to be confounded rather than clarified. The definition of religion from a scientific standpoint is less definitive and less objective than some which the writers reject. One is quite surprised that authorities in the field of the psychology of religion such as Coe, Leuba, Pratt, Haydon and Trout should be disregarded in attempting to arrive at a more scientific definition. As a result a definition of religion is proposed which makes little use of the thinking and research which has been done in this field and makes no contribution to it. How can we deal scientifically with "the sum total of the effects which traits, aptitudes, skills, information, God and man have upon the behavior-conduct of man?" In such a catch-all why should the more dynamic aspects such as attitudes, interests and purposes be left out? If science can

not know God how can it measure the effects of God on man? What is the concept of God which allows it to be categorized with "information, traits, aptitude and skills?" In what ways is religious behavior to be differentiated from other behavior if the effects of all these factors on man's behavior are to be considered the criteria of religion? What is meant by behavior-conduct? Is not conduct rather a more restricted form of behavior? The confusion is increased by the apparent typographical omission of the negative in the statements following the definition which are diametrically opposed to each other as they now read.

The balance of the article is devoted to a most inadequate resumé of some of the so-called character tests which have been used in this field. What function they may have in religious education is far from clear. What relationships the various aspects have in developing a religious personality is not suggested. The article assumes an individualistic concept of personality in which atomistic traits, skills, etc., can be dealt with as segregated phenomena. Many tests are suggested which are of dubious reliability such as the Downey "Will Temperament" test. Contrary to the statement of the authors, the greatest difficulty does not lie in securing reliability but in securing validity. Few makers of tests can demonstrate scientifically that their tests measure what they purport to measure. Testing seems to have been accepted "en toto" by the writers at a time when character educators are becoming increasingly skeptical about the dogmatic claims of ardent testers.

From the viewpoint of the religious educator one is rather impressed with the significant omissions in the tests which are

suggested. The numerous knowledge tests of the Character Education Inquiry are absent entirely. The many personality and emotional tests of Laird, Thurstone, Kohlstat, Bernreuter and others do not receive mention. The "Interest" tests are not even suggested. The whole realm of performance tests by Hartshorne and May and others with their social implications certainly deserve consideration from any student of measurement in religious education. Many significant researches have been made during the last five years in this field which have revealed fundamental changes in our concepts of personality. Religious education is being confronted with a changing psychology, a changing sociology, a changing economics, and a changing ethics. It needs not less scientific but more scientific techniques and methods if it is to help religion achieve a worth while function in the social reconstruction of a confused world.

I cannot close this comment without suggesting to the reader the most recent and most scientific contribution to this subject which has been published in some years. I refer to Dr. D. M. Trout's book entitled *Religious Behavior* published by Macmillan and Company. His last chapter on "Investigation" deals convincingly, although not exhaustively, with a scientific approach to research in religion.

DAVID E. SONQUIST.

Personnel Director, Packard Manor School, Chautauqua, New York.

\* \* \*

#### What About Service and Responsibility?

To the Editor: The article entitled "Radio, A New Religion?" appearing in the May issue has raised several questions in my mind.

It seems to me that this author, in discussing the secular religion obtainable by radio, is omitting one of the greatest phases of religion—that of service, the giving of time, money and talents for the sake of others.

Ruling out the church services and devotional periods, as did the author, I wonder whether one will receive anything else from this radio religion besides a higher

standard of ideals. Can the radio programs bring the individual into personal relationship with his God for communion and fellowship?

As I see it, one of the greatest dangers from a radio religion is that people will remain at home to listen to a preacher who probably is more noted than their local pastor, but in so doing they will fail to assume the responsibilities which should be their's in the local church.

FRANCIS BIRTCIL.  
Presbyterian College of Christian Education, Chicago.

\* \* \*

#### More About the Christian College!

To the Editor: Mr. Fairley's letter in the March number convinced me that he has an entirely inadequate conception of a Christian college. His statement in the May number convinces me that his conception of the Christian aim in education is just as fallacious. He has drawn a caricature of the Christian aim and then presumes that this represents the thinking of Christian educators to-day. Just as he built up an idea of a Christian college which does not exist, so he has set forth an aim of Christian education which no one with normal intelligence would maintain. If Mr. Fairley's ideas of the Christian college, or the aim of Christian education, were even approximately true, they would have vanished from the earth long ago.

I agree with Mr. Fairley that we should avoid being offensive to non-Christian groups in our inter-faith fellowships. But when he would reduce Christianity to terms acceptable to every non-Christian group he reduces the message of Jesus to a harmless nonentity. If good breeding means reducing Christian philosophy to terms acceptable to all alike, I want none of it. Nor can I respect the Jew who waters down his religion so as to make it acceptable to the non-Jew. A universal religion which can be purchased only at the cost of what is distinctive to Christianity is too great a price to pay.

WILLIAM LINDSAY YOUNG.  
General Director Department of University Work, Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.



---

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*Social Aims In A Changing World.* By  
WALTER G. BEACH. Stanford University,  
California: Stanford University  
Press. 1932. Pp. 156. \$1.75.

It is a rare gift to think clearly. Almost equally rare is the gift of laconic exposition. When these two gifts are combined, as in the case of Professor Beach, the reader is on the way to hidden treasure. Seldom has a sociologist been able to pack so much sound wisdom in such brief compass as Beach does in this little volume. His fundamental problem is the tendency of industrial civilization to substitute means for ends and to consider instruments, techniques and processes as valuable in themselves instead of as means to human freedom and social well-being. In the wake of rampant individualistic industrialism, Beach uncovers the social disintegration which he accounts for primarily in terms of human mobility. The modern industrial city is typical of this disintegration of traditional mental patterns brought about by "uprooted" or "migratory" minds. The wholesale migration which has characterized the last century has caused a loss of respect for social institutions, group loyalty and the uniformity of behavior which tend to go together and express settled community life. "Loyalties represent the channels through which the social spirit runs. But a moving, migratory world is one in which the customary channels are broken. Shattered social relationships are followed not only by a breaking away from old loyalties, but often by a failure to build new ones. . . . The unity of the modern city is functional, not traditional."

Hence, what Beach calls tradition-carriers and community-standard builders grow weaker. This necessitates, therefore, the creation of a new community conscience to grapple with the growing complexity of modern economic variety and mobility. Beach does not tell us how to create this new, freer type of organization which shall have unity in spite of variety. He only suggests that the proper objective is to create new loyalties and, in Dewey's words, to

"convert the great society into the great community." He would expand this local community conscience also to dimensions adequate to build a world conscience.

As steps in this direction he argues for the social control of individualistic business, the creation of new types of education for opportunity, the building of a social outlook toward opportunity and freedom instead of dependence upon philanthropy and discipline. In this general direction, religion is to be depended upon to express and vitalize the co-operative purposes of society, to aid in the unifying of good will as expressed in social purpose.

While Beach lays bare many sore spots in the body politic, he is by no means pessimistic but holds that it is possible to create "a new social culture of unified behavior, sentiments and beliefs expressing an increase of rational organization towards common ends." He finds evidence of the growth of knowledge and the effort to apply it to the building of a more rational culture life in the service of more united communities and an ordered world. He even takes comfort in the fact that many wars will probably be prevented through the dawning upon the minds of "war interests" that modern wars tend to be followed by social revolutions which displace in their process the classes or interests abetting and profiting by war.

The book would be worth while if for no other reason than the delicate irony with which "purple cow" philosophy is hit off. Beach uses the parody of Gillette Burgess' familiar quatrain,

"I never saw a purple cow  
And never hope to see one;  
But from the kind of milk we get  
I'm sure that there must be one,"

and applies it by way of criticizing the tendency of the comfortable classes in society to explain social evils as the result of individual qualities of character. He justly points out that such reasoning neglects to "consider the tremendous factor between the two, the factor we call the social sys-

tem. . . . All explanation of social life in terms of individual qualities partakes of this irrational nonsense; it leaves out of account the social middleman, the social system, which, we should recognize, largely determines the cost and the blunders of human life.—*Arthur J. Todd*

\* \* \*

*Divorce, A Social Interpretation.* By J. P. LICHTENBERGER. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1931. Pp. 472. \$4.00.

One test of a good book is that after twenty years' service as a standard monograph in its field, it can be revised and still occupy a commanding place. Professor Lichtenberger's study meets that test. His monograph has held its place because of its sober presentation of fact, its freedom from bias or crankiness, and its courage to come to grips with fact. Lichtenberger's approach to his subject is from the standpoint of two facts; first, that the "disintegration of marriages constitutes one of the major problems of modern civilization," and, second, that it is "not so much that the institution of marriage is breaking down as that individual marriages are." His method is analytical, for which he is deeply indebted to the monumental work of the late George E. Howard.

In the development of his case, one by one popular prejudices fall by the wayside, for he finds that the increase in divorce does not necessarily mean an increase in unhappiness; that city divorce rates are not uniformly higher than rural; that Negro divorce rates are not higher than white; that childless families do not manifest a uniformly higher divorce rate than families with children; that new statutory grounds for divorce do not increase divorce; that uniform divorce laws would not have much effect; that church legislation registers no effective check.

Twenty years have not changed Lichtenberger's conclusions on the ineffectiveness of divorce legislation in slowing up the divorce rate. The reason for his conviction is that the present underlying and precipitating cause of increased divorce is to be found in rapid economic changes and in changing scientific, political, moral and religious concepts.

He points out that divorce rates are popularly exaggerated and that the situation in regard to the dissolution of existing marriages at the present time is far from being so "alarming" as commonly supposed. Likewise he notes the well-established fact that marriage seems to be gaining in favor.

As to constructive proposals, he suggests

a more scientific approach to considering the problem and, in that connection, urges "the visualizing of marriage as an emergent and evolving social institution based upon enduring but changing human needs" and therefore as such without any inherent fixity of type or finality of form. He rightly concludes that there is no panacea for solving the problem, but that two measures calculated to help would be removal of the stigma of divorce as a remedial measure and the freeing marriage from certain impediments which hinder its better adaptation to modern requirements. In the course of his analysis he rejects preaching, damning, Pollyanna talk, free love, and trial marriage as popularly conceived. Companionate marriage he examines but finds little in it apparently that is new to be praised, to be feared, or to be blamed.

As to the future of marriage and divorce, Lichtenberger refuses to take on the prophetic mantle but he does declare that those who predict the collapse of marriage seem to be lacking in historical perspective, and that "there is little danger that conjugal affection and all the finer sentiments associated with the ideals of married life at its best, the products of a long and painful experience, will of themselves fade away or become less effective. They can be crushed to death but they thrive in the atmosphere of freedom." He quotes with approval a dictum of a European writer to the effect "that the idea of the unhappy marriage is still current among us, in the future it will probably be a curiosity."

On a few minor points the reviewer and probably many readers will disagree with the author. For example, he ignores mob psychology as one of the producing causes of a feverish divorce rate. He tends to exaggerate the changes in the economic function of the modern family. At times he exhibits a tendency to accept authorities uncritically, and his explanation of the tremendous and sudden drop in the divorce rate of Japan belies his own disbelief in the effectiveness of divorce legislation. Notwithstanding these minor faults, Doctor Lichtenberger's book should continue as one of the standard monographs on this subject of profound social interest.—*Arthur J. Todd*

\* \* \*

*International Survey of the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations.* New York: The International Survey Committee. 1932. Pp. 425.

On the basis of the experience of forty years, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations of North America have attempted to appraise their for-

eign work and to discover data upon which to base policies of further development. The survey covered work in thirty countries organized into four regions, and occupied a little more than two years.

A unique feature of the organization of the survey was the creation of national commissions and the appointment of national consultants to co-operate with the American directors, with authority in preparation of the reports from the countries surveyed. From the standpoint of technical survey procedure this policy is open to criticism and in the carrying out of the survey proved disappointing. The reasons for adopting this procedure was the fact that the national movements are autonomous because of the educative result such a procedure might have. On the latter ground it may have been justified.

The survey sought information on the following problems: (1) Does the foreign work present a unified program continuous with the essential purpose of the Associations? (2) Is membership based upon a vital experience of participation in the movement as a character-building process rather than upon artificial "bases"? (3) Do the national movements have an adequate policy for recruiting and training and supporting leadership? (4) Are the relations between foreign and national secretaries satisfactory? (5) Is the program in each country consistent with its cultural environment? (6) Are the movements becoming, as intended, indigenous? (7) Are American policies concerning finance conducive to self-support? (8) Are the movements successful in not fostering economic penetration or Protestant proselytizing?

The report is organized in two parts. Part I presents the findings in general on these eight items, with brief summaries of conditions in each of the fields studied. Part II presents the philosophy of the Association Movement, the problem of the relation of the movements to the non-Protestant and non-Christian religions in the various countries, the problem of building indigenous movements, and a body of conclusions and recommendations.

On the whole, the answers to the eight problems, with many variations in the fields studied, are affirmative. Within the range of general affirmative results the survey shows that there is a good deal of fundamentally divergent viewpoint between the English-American conception of the movements as a non-theological fellowship and the German-Continental conception of the movements as theological and ecclesiastical.

The survey pronounces in favor of the non-theological and non-ecclesiastical direction of future development. The survey commends the basis of membership conceived as vital participation in the fellowship and activities that make for Christian character-development of persons rather than any formal basis of belief or church membership. In some countries the movement has been extensive and rather indefinite in its objectives, with tendencies in some instances to engage in opportunistic "service" and community activities. The findings recommend a clearer definition of purpose and the more intensive occupation of areas entered, and a closer adherence to the essential functions of the Associations as personality-forming influences through their fellowships. There is a good deal of discontent among the national personnel and difficulty in securing representative nationals for the secretariat. There is also a good deal of friction between the American secretaries and the nationals. The survey recommends that these tensions be relieved by the limiting of the functions of the foreign secretaries chiefly to the discovery and training of nationals and by the adjustment of the living standards of foreign secretaries to national standards. It is recommended that training be carried on through supervision on the job rather than in professional schools. In foreign financing it is recommended that the control of funds be shifted to nationals gradually rather than suddenly, and that allocation of funds be to local associations rather than to national organizations. In order to avoid further deficits in the foreign budget, it is recommended that greater regard be had for a rational estimate of realizable resources in the light of economic conditions in America and by a more careful study of the interests of the supporting constituency. It is felt that there should be a closer co-operation between the American movements and the foreign movements. On account of the different status of women in foreign countries generally, it is recommended that no attempt be made for the present to unite the Men's and Women's Associations.

On the whole, the survey shows that the Associations have a healthy objective and critical attitude toward their work. One of the most valuable sections of the report is that setting forth the philosophy of the Association movements as a developing process against the backgrounds of their historical evolution in adapting themselves to changing cultural conditions.—*William Clayton Bower*

*American Society.* By CHARLES F. THWING.  
New York: The Macmillan Company.  
1931. Pp. 271. \$2.25.

This book by the venerable President Emeritus of Western Reserve University takes a worthy place in a long list of noteworthy writings by the same author. It does not possess the unity to be found in many other of his writings, nor does it show the vigor of treatment which characterizes his earlier works. It is rather marked by ripeness and maturity of opinion on a large number of subjects pertaining to American society during the last decade.

The book is a collection of essays and speeches written during the years 1911 to 1930. In general the subjects turn around the World War. Though some of the material was written before the War began, yet it can all be regarded as dealing with the American society which entered the War, went through it, and emerged into the hectic decade which followed and whose influences are still with us.

The chapter headings show the scope of the book. They are: "The Best and the Worst in American Society," "The American Family," "The Pilgrims' Motive and Contribution," "The Effect of the European War on Higher Learning in American Society," "The American Civil War and the Great War—A Comparison," "The Prospects of Liberal Education After the Great War," "Public Opinion in The United States in the Last Three Years: 1914-1917," "American Society After The Great War," "Ruling Ideas in American Society," "What Are the Tests of a Nation's Civilization? Can America Meet Them?" "Growth of Institutions in American Society."

The treatment is more that of admonition than of keen analysis and criticism. The book tends to leave one with a sense of well-being, fairly well satisfied with things as they are, but yet with a mild desire to improve them.

Education is, of course, the best avenue of improvement. Yet education needs some fundamental searching of both purpose and method before it can fulfill its mission. Fortunately this searching is already under way.

Religion should lend a most helpful hand, —and will, provided it can get away from the decisive influence of such trivialities as the difference between buttons and hooks and eyes on one's clothes and the difference between one and another translation of a word, and provided further there is a return to the more effective sort or sorts of mysticism. Usually times of distress deepen

a sense of the reality of the unseen; sometimes they emphasize materialism.

Education, religion, business, and government are all tending toward greater freedom, and the total result, though showing some detriment, is good. Its tendency is toward the making of a better world,—a nobler man.

It is splendid to see the wide-awake optimism of this veteran educator who has come with American society through many a vicissitude, and is still looking forward to the best that is yet to be.—John D. Finlayson

\* \* \*

*What is Boys' Work?* By WALTER L. STONE.  
New York: Association Press, 1931. Pp. 206. \$2.00.

The term "Boys' Work" has come to be used so widely and with so many meanings that Mr. Stone's attempt to strip it of its ambiguity is very much worth while. His book aims to classify and describe the objectives, principles, practices, and organizations connoted by the term, and to put them in such order that the professional worker with boys; church, school, or other institutional executives responsible for organizing work for boys along modern lines; and, to some extent, volunteer workers may know what they mean when they talk about boys' work. The author evidently assumes that scout executives, Y. M. C. A. boys' work secretaries, church workers with boys, executives of 4-H clubs, and so forth, have so much in common that their work partakes of the nature of a distinctive profession, a profession not yet well established, but on the way.

Mr. Stone's discussion of the nature, content, and method of boys' work includes its purpose and scope; group organization; program building; individual guidance; leadership training; the profession of boys' work; supervision; co-operation among organizations; and a summary of principles. He quotes extensively from educators, sociologists, and the writers of organization materials; his own comparisons, interpretations, and summaries are so brief that the book fails to give a unified and clear picture of the interesting enterprise of which it speaks. It does, however, give an immense amount of suggestive material that will help boys' workers to see their work in larger terms. It emphasizes the need for community-wide co-operation in boys' work. The lesson should not be lost in churches in which Scout troops, Junior Achievement Clubs, Young People's Societies and Sun-

day school classes all exist side by side without integration.

The book should be read by Y. M. C. A. boys' work secretaries, scout executives, directors of religious education, boys' club executives, and pastors. It will help them to see the surprisingly varied and virile way in which the interest of the nation in its youth has found expression in the past twenty-five years. It will help to correct any lingering impression that boys' work is a nice little hobby for maladjusted men.

A very fine bibliography at the end adds to the usefulness of this book.—*L. K. Hall*



*America's Tomorrow.* By C. C. FURNAS. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1932, Pp. 295. \$2.00.

Religious educators should be interested in studying carefully the trend of the times in this country, if they are to prepare young people for meeting present and future social problems. Especially is this true if the mechanical developments of the future are going to usher in a shorter and shorter working day, until many people will labor only two hours a day, as this book suggests.

This book opens with a discussion on whether the physical sciences are taking us. In this section of the book the author is at his best, particularly in presenting some of the advances which may be expected from science and invention. However, it seems hardly in keeping with the general treatment of most of his subjects to introduce a fantastic and speculative discussion regarding interplanetary travel.

The author continues with a discussion of what is to be expected from the biological sciences. In this he discusses in a critical fashion such subjects as eugenics and the prolongation of life. Most of the material and the argument presented is not new for those who have done some reading in the field of population problems.

The third section of the book presents the contributions of the social sciences which must be drawn on to enrich the Age of Leisure, which is supposed to be just ahead. This portion of the book, and the final chapters regarding standardization, agriculture, and the motives of men grow weaker, both in argument and in facts, to point out what is to be expected in the future.

The general style of this book is popular, sprinkled with considerable humor of the noon-luncheon-club variety. The chapters seem to be taken from chautauqua lectures. The book argues for a capitalism in which machines are to be made the servant of man,

but the facts presented are not convincing. The author suggests again and again that a much shorter working day is possible, but at no time does he discuss adequately or give reasons for believing that capitalists will overcome the profit motive which leads them to force workmen to serve for long hours at low pay. All in all, the book does not seem to be that scholarly type of product which should come from a Doctor of Philosophy who is connected with an outstanding university. What is needed is a book in this field to match the recent volume on the history of this country up-to-date which has come from the pen of James Trueslow Adams, and entitled *The Epic of America*. Then religious educators will have something worth discussing in groups in order to evaluate their present work, and lay plans for the future.—*W. Ryland Boorman*



*Discovering the Genius Within You.* By STANWOOD COBB. New York: The John Day Company, 1932. Pp. 287, \$2.50.

Some teachers of social psychology claim that one of the best places to study human nature is in books of fiction or biography, for here you have the raw material of human behavior arrayed in order and analyzed for you, and besides put in more readable form than most scientific texts.

*Discovering the Genius Within You* is to be recommended on the same score. It has a rich store of scientific data set forth with literary skill. It is like a book of essays of the more intimate sort; the author takes you into his confidence, sharing with you many personal experiences. This gives the book a bona fide authority and also the chattiness of a private conversation.

The book opens with the assertion "the power of creativeness is open to every one." The remainder of the book is given over to the substantiating of this claim and to explaining in simple terms the way in which this creative power may be developed.

First of all it is noted that all men of genius work for "goals they have chosen themselves." The man of genius "is not crimped and strained by his circumstances—he bends them to his own ends."

Bringing out the genius within you involves also concentration upon the thing in hand. One of the most striking points of the book is the emphasis upon the need for an inner discipline. In these days when we deliver ourselves over so much to control by the machine and the thought of others through radio and press, this advice is certainly well in point.

Capacity for enthusiasm is also a mark of genius. "If you have no enthusiasm," warns the author, "then you should take care. Something is at fault, either your line of work or your health or your psychological balance."

These and many other suggestions in regard to the genius within you are set forth not as abstract statements but with exemplifications from literature and the lives of interesting individuals. These instances are not all chosen from the lives of great geniuses, but from the lives of individuals of the everyday sort with whom the author has come in touch. This adds to the charm of the book and also to the proof of his main thesis—the universality of genius. It is also an indication of the wide contacts and rich experience that lie back of this book.

As is evidenced by many statements, Stanwood Cobb is very much a mystic. For some this would lead to a complete disavowal of the book. Anyone who gives so much emphasis to the hidden sources of genius cannot be scientific. But who can be didactic about personality? Does anyone know sufficiently about the winds of the spirit that he can deny certain possibilities?

It is his appreciation of some of the mysterious forces shaping personality that seem to call forth an almost poetical expression; for example, in the chapter dealing with Environment and Atmosphere we find this beautiful statement:

Before we know it, impressions from our surroundings have stolen into our souls and influenced our moods. A scene remembered from childhood, the sound of a distant waterfall—without conscious volition our feelings are stirred, our minds are in agitation, as when a pebble breaks the glass-like surface of a pool. We see the dead leaves fluttering in the fall, and something of the melancholy of death comes uninvited into our hearts.

The author does not neglect the social aspects of this matter for he has chapters on the larger social aspects of the problem such as "The New Education," "The World of the Adult," "A Creative Society."

There is an arrangement of the book that gives it a little distinctive quality just from the mechanical point of view. At the end of each chapter there is some striking quotation printed in large type setting forth the main idea of the chapter. This is followed by a brief summary of the thought of the chapter.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Cobb anticipates the production of a companion book to this. This one, as he says, covers but one side of life—self-development, self-expression. There is need of "harmoniza-

tion with those other selves who together with us compose humanity." The next book will deal with this subject.—*Victor E. Marriott.*

\* \* \*

*The Mastery of Life.* By JOHN HERMAN RANDALL. New York: McBride Publishing Company, 1931. Pp. 362. \$2.50.

The title of this book suggests another contribution to self-help psychology, but such is not the case. On the contrary, the author, who is the pastor of the Community Church of New York, has written some thought-provoking essays regarding the outlook for the moral, social, and political betterment of the world. In a critical and open-minded manner, he deals with such questions as, "How Can We Bring Our Minds Up To Date?" "Can We Still Believe In Progress?" and "Must We Choose Between Optimism or Pessimism?"

While the purpose of the book is to encourage a spirit of hope for social progress through the development of more creative thinking, the treatment is so frank and the presentation is such that at times an attitude of doubt is provoked in the mind of the reader, that is, the author is not convincing in his chapters on "Can We Hope To Change Human Nature?" "Can We Conquer Our Prejudices?" and "Do Men Want To Know The Truth?" The great need today is more "creative thinking" in the realm of human relationships, and what he means by creative thinking is the ability "to see familiar things differently."

The element of greatest value in this book, and, at the same time, the major weakness grows out of the attempt of the author "to see familiar things differently." The reader is encouraged to look for a fresh treatment of each subject, and, in the main, he is not to be disappointed. On the other hand, the author needlessly accepts, for instance, the familiar instinctive theory of instincts and tries to consider it differently by suggesting possibilities for sublimating instincts. In like manner, he almost accepts the familiar view that human nature cannot be changed and has a hard time trying to give a new emphasis to it (pp. 177-203). When he reaches p. 346, he quotes John Dewey to point out that "there is nothing easier to change than human nature." The author does not suggest, as he might well have done, that creative thinking arises from discarding "the old familiar views" as rapidly as more effective ones can be discovered.

Every practical educator should read a book of this type about once a year in order

to evaluate the specific work he is engaged in, and to orient himself again in relation to the more fundamental social objectives of education. The book is well written, not too abstract, and stimulates thought. At the same time, it does not go far enough in its claims of hope for the future of the human race as it might have done, due to the fact that the author is trying "to see familiar things differently."—W. Ryland Boorman

\* \* \*

*Modern Psychologies and Education.* By CLARENCE E. RAGSDALE. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932. Pp. 418. \$2.25.

Ragsdale in *Modern Psychologies and Education* attempts to give a brief account of five modern schools of psychology and to point out the view of each school on important educational problems. The schools chosen are (1) the structuralists, represented by such men as Titchener and Bentley; (2) the functionalists, represented by Angell and Dewey; (3) the behaviorists or objectivists, represented by Watson and Max Meyer; (4) the purposivists, represented by McDougall; and (5) the psychoanalysts, represented by Freud, Jung, and Adler.

The chapters of the text are a combination of those to be found in textbooks of psychology and principles or introductions to education. Under the first group Ragsdale points out the difference in point of view between the different schools on such topics as instinct, emotion, mental inheritance, and learning. The later chapters of the text treat of such topics as individualized activities, pre-school education, and extra-curricular activities. In these chapters the psychological bases of these chapters are stressed; and, again, as far as possible the differences in points of view of the various schools, where real differences exist are stressed.

By this method Ragsdale has prepared a means whereby the teacher with only a rudimentary knowledge of general psychology may become acquainted with the different points of view of modern psychology and come to appreciate the psychological bases for different educational practices. Such a text performs a valuable service, and the author shows a keen appreciation of his subject.

The reviewer, as a psychologist, is not fully able to anticipate whether the average teacher will be able to read and understand such a text as this. The task of the author is a difficult one. However, it seems that the topics presented in the text are dealt

with in as clear and untechnical a fashion as it is possible to deal with them.

The only adverse criticism of the text is that the field of discussion is so extensive that the treatment is necessarily sketchy. This holds both for the individual topics and for chapter discussions. The chapter on learning is an excellent exception to this general rule. It is also unfortunate that the text quotes extensively from modern writings but does not give a single specific reference to sources from which quotations and points of view were taken.—A. R. Gilliland

\* \* \*

*The Mind in Action; A Study of Motives and Values.* By A. CAMPBELL GARNETT. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1932. Pp. 226. \$2.00.

This study of the nature and process of motivation, by Professor Garnett of Butler University, is made from a point of view somewhat more characteristic of English than of American psychology. The influence which the author acknowledges in his preface, to Ward, Spearman, Aveling, and McDougall, is apparent throughout, and perhaps most conspicuously to the last-named. For, in spite of divergencies in detail from McDougall, this little book may be regarded as "hormic psychology." That is, mental life is no mere stimulus-response system. It is the constantly changing, forward-looking, end-seeking activities of the organism (or as the author prefers, the "self") in its effort to understand and master its environment so as to attain the maximal satisfaction of its purposes. Even instincts are no mere systems or chains of reflexes; they are to be thought of rather as the "dependable" motives, involving always some foresight of the end pursued, in response to the cognition of the meaningful situation, and thus akin to, rather than to be contrasted with, intelligence. The various instincts are to be distinguished from one another in terms of the ends in which they normally terminate.

Other types of motive besides instinct, including feelings, appetites, intelligence, habits, sentiments, and character, are considered from the same viewpoint—the conscious pursuit of meaningful ends. It is, of course, in the fully developed character, with its abstract and ideal sentiments, and its systems of moral and religious values, that we find the climax of human goal-seeking. In the pursuit of truth, beauty, and goodness, the unification of separate motives into harmonious systems and patterns becomes the self's primary objective.

While addressed to the intelligent layman as well as to the psychologist, this book is not a popularization of the subject. It is rather Professor Garnett's effort to work out consistently his own account of the motivation process with incidental reference, at most, to other viewpoints. (Also, incidentally, with a rather inadequate index.) It will probably lend reassurance to readers who fear that all modern psychology inevitably minimizes, if not destroys, the significance of the higher life-values—philosophy, art, morality, religion. But it will not wholly satisfy the inquiring psychologist who wishes to know if "a 'behavior mechanism' is . . . inherently different from an inanimate mechanical structure" (p. 18, note 2), just what that difference is; and if an "activity . . . may not be physical, but can be purely mental" (p. 4), what "purely mental activity" can be. There may be an answer to such queries; but such casual references as appear to these very fundamental issues, smack of vitalism that will be quite unacceptable to many biologically-minded psychologists.—*Forrest A. Kingsbury*

\* \* \*

*Personality and Will.* By FRANCIS AVELING. New York: Appleton and Company, 1931. Pp. 246. \$2.00.

This book is the second publication in a projected "Contemporary Library of Psychology" of which the author of the present volume is editor. This library is designed to present in a popular way a comprehensive view of the entire field of psychology.

The author's thesis is that the self as will is the core and central nucleus of personality. He defines personality "not merely as the organization of so-called mental contents, traits, capacities, and reaction tendencies, but as that final perfection which virtually includes in itself all the principles of human activity and constitutes a unitary self-conscious and (to some extent, at least) self-determining individual." The author's method is historical and experimental. In his historical procedure, however, he traces merely the development of the idea which his thesis propounds in the literature of the pre-scientific and scientific periods. There is no attempt to take account of the enormous literature on personality that has resulted from the more recent objective laboratory studies in this field. Nor is there any critical review of different points of view in regard to the nature of personality

and the processes that are involved in its development. The whole behavioristic approach is dismissed with six lines; the whole psychoanalytical approach is dismissed in seven lines. The author's experimental technique is limited entirely to the data of introspection. He takes no count of the objective techniques of the laboratory procedures upon which contemporary psychology in America is placing its major emphasis.

Mr. Aveling's discussion is set in radical contrast to the most significant trends in psychological technique in American thought. His conclusions regarding the place of conscious purpose as a determining factor in the development of personality and behavior are of special interest to those who work in the field of moral and religious education. His contribution, however, in support of this factor in personality development will be of little use to American investigators and practitioners who look to other sources than those employed by him for the validation of their procedures and results.—*William Clayton Bower*

\* \* \*

*The Minister, The Method, and The Message.* By HAROLD ADYE PRICHARD. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons 1932. Pp. 298. \$2.50.

*The Minister, The Method and The Message*, by Prichard, is a very readable discussion of the preacher's methods of work, with particular emphasis on his methods of sermon preparation. Preaching, as conceived by the author, is sharing the preacher's experience of God with his congregation. The preacher who has no experience of God has no message. His habits of daily life and study are set forth in this book in such a way as to put him in the way of acquiring such an experience.

The most valuable part of the book is the section on "The Preparation and Delivery" of the sermon in which the methods of nine more or less well-known preachers (only three of whom are not Episcopalians) are set forth in their own words. Many students of "The Art of Preaching" will read this section with great profit to themselves.

Throughout the author holds to the viewpoint that the hope of the church is in preaching. Just when non-liturgical churches are pinning their hope to liturgy and "worship" it is refreshing to have one speaking from an experience with liturgy on behalf of the sermon.—*Miles H. Krumbine*

*The Prospects of Humanism.* By LAWRENCE HYDE. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931. Pp. 249. \$3.50.

This is the second volume that Mr. Hyde has written within the last few years. His first book, *The Learned Knife*, was published in 1928. He is now engaged in writing a third volume, a philosophical study of the modern religious problem.

The second volume of this trilogy is a criticism of modern humanism from three angles: the rational, the ethical and the esthetic. A section is given to a consideration of each of these three cultural agencies.

By way of introduction Mr. Hyde points out certain conditions existing in the 19th century which have given rise to a new generation of critics. The last century concerned itself with institutions, external conditions of existence and realized political and social freedom to a marked degree. But this newly acquired political and social freedom is being exercised today in a destructive, wasteful, and ignoble fashion. "The task before us is that of persuading a race of beings, who are to an exceptional degree free from external restraints, to impose some sort of voluntary restraint upon themselves."

These modern critics are more concerned with the psychological issues of life than the political or social. Mr. Hyde believes that writers like Mr. Wells and Mr. Shaw, with their almost exclusive pre-occupation with the more external features of the social problem, have now ceased to exert any really significant influence upon the modern mind.

The points of view of these modern writers are diverse in regard to many issues but generally agree in two respects. "They are in process of recoil from the superficial and unjustified optimism of the last century," and with rare exceptions they are men whose philosophical basis is definitely humanistic rather than religious. Their attitude is essentially secular.

In considering, in turn, man's rational, ethical, and esthetic life Mr. Hyde is concerned with developing and defending the thesis "that man cannot effectively solve his problems unless he is prepared to look upwards for inspiration to something which lies above the plane of the purely human."

Thought is a function of being, and not vice versa. Illumination is dependent upon inward purification. "The task of a thinker is not that of polishing and refining his mind, but that of becoming something which boasts a spiritual significance." The qualities of life, which are needed to penetrate into reality, are intuition and faith.

In dealing with the humanistic approach to man's ethical life Mr. Hyde centers his

attention upon "that group of American critics, who, under the distinguished leadership of Professor Irving Babbitt, are at present engaged in propagating the doctrines of the New Humanism." Special attention is given to the writings of Mr. Babbitt. Contrary to the position held by Mr. Babbitt, men and women cannot derive adequate inspiration and support from ethical principles alone, but are driven in the end to transcend this level of apprehension and realize the Good in that more interior and immediate fashion associated with religion.

The problem of humility for the humanist is a difficult one because "the man who is devoting his powers to perfecting his own self, inevitably becomes a victim of egoism. It is not easy to be at once self-reliant and humble."

Humanism will never make any great appeal to the masses because it fails to develop the imagination, or liberate the emotions.

In the last division of the volume Mr. Hyde turns his critical attention especially upon the writings of Middleton Murry, whom he considers to be the outstanding leader of the recent movement, the New Romanticism.

Mr. Murry's philosophy is that of the poet, whose virtue lies in his impulse to embody the truth on the plane of art. The poet deals with life through the medium of the senses, and is dependent upon the world of appearances. The artist may be a vehicle for inspiration, without incarnating reality and expressing it through the will. He relies almost wholly upon pigments, words or notes of music as mediums for the expression of truth.

The religious mystic, on the contrary, seeks to realize subjectively that which the poet contemplates. This inner experience of the Good transcends any beauty, truth, or goodness which is possessed by the objects in the world. The nature of the Good is most truly revealed in personality, or through human beings, who have been transformed by it.

Mr. Hyde's concluding evaluation of the philosophy of the New Romanticism is expressed in the following: "A philosophy of pure aestheticism can never win our allegiance for more than a brief season. It may temporarily beguile the minds of those who have revolted from the abstractions of rationalism, but in the end it will leave us with dust and ashes in our mouths."

While space does not permit a lengthy criticism of this volume, two weaknesses are briefly mentioned. First, it is surprising that a man of Mr. Hyde's caliber should fall

a victim of the "either-or" fallacy. His emphasis is almost solely upon the development of the individual through the mystic experience. Little significance is attached to service as a means of developing individual character or a social order. The appeal for a social passion is lacking. Second, Mr. Hyde makes constant reference to religion and mysticism without any extended treatment of the nature of either. His interpretation of religious experience is inadequate considering the important place which he gives it in life. The reader is too often called upon at this point to follow understandingly by implication only. Perhaps we shall have more from him upon this subject in his next volume.

Whether the reader is or is not in agreement with the author, this is one of those books which stimulates serious thinking upon fundamental issues of modern life.—

S. P. Franklin



*The Life of Emerson.* By VAN WYCK BROOKS. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1932. Pp. 315. \$3.00.

Mr. Brooks is trying to evaluate accurately American letters. It is now twelve years since he wrote his study of Mark Twain, and seven since his study of Henry James appeared. The former writer stayed in America and surrendered to the time in which he lived; the latter forsook America, but never took root in Europe deeply enough to mature his great genius. Both were frustrated souls. Whitman, Mr. Brooks holds, is truly American, but Emerson is what an American ought to be. This last is Brooks' best book. Every lover of Emerson will hail it with joy. It is a great book.

To most Americans Emerson is the greatest mind America has produced, although Professor Wundt of Leipzig used to tell his students that he considered Jonathan Edwards so. Interestingly enough, both Emerson and Edwards were Christian ministers, both excelled as literary artists, both left the pastorate for a wider calling. In all else they were poles apart. Edwards was an orthodox Calvinist; Emerson was an unorthodox Unitarian. Edwards worked out a flawlessly logical system of theology; Emerson apparently could not write a systematic treatise. He excelled in aphorism.

Today Edwards is respected, but Emerson is loved by an ever increasing number. Where Edwards is mentioned once, Emerson is the subject of a thousand hymns of praise. We are impatient with metaphysics, we yearn for immediate inspiration.

It is just one hundred years ago that Emerson resigned his pulpit, the Second

Church of Boston. His immediate reason was a disagreement with his congregation on the essential meaning of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The remote reason he confided to his *Journal* in these words: "It is the best part of the man that revolts most against being a minister. His good revolts from official goodness." It was the official religiosity of the clergy that drove Emerson out to the quiet village of Concord. Somehow we all today revolt against official goodness—just as Jesus did 1900 years ago. Emerson was brave enough to protest. But he always remained a preacher. He exchanged his pulpit for the lecture platform, but his lectures were sermons. He was essentially a reformer—a kind of reformer extraordinary. He hated vulgar reformers.

He lived in a day when religious leaders feared science and yet in 1831 he wrote: "The religion that is afraid of science dishonors God and commits suicide." This is another reason why Emerson is admired so loyally today. He had prophetic insight.

He lived in a day when men owned slaves and justified their behavior by appealing to the Bible. But Emerson opposed slavery, and opposed it courageously—"So far as the negroes were concerned, he had never accepted the complacent view of Boston that slavery was a part of the natural order of the world" (p. 245). Mr. Brooks emphasizes something very real in Emerson's character when he insists that he could not forget his visit to Florida when he heard the auctioneer in St. Augustine selling "four children without the mother" and heard the Church raising money to send "the Scriptures to the continent from which they had been kidnapped."

Such a man as this, if he were true to himself (and Emerson always was), just had to retire to his little village. Official Christianity could not bear such a representative. In Concord he lived in communion with another of her great sons, Thoreau. It is as impossible to imagine these two prophets running on a schedule as to imagine Isaiah and Jeremiah doing it. Gradually others came thither. Concord became a focal center from which emanated wisdom, virtue, goodness, purified religion, not only to America but to all the earth.

Emerson is yet the prophet of the people. He warned of what is upon us today. "Things are in the saddle and they ride mankind." We begin to understand what he meant. He believed in man past our comprehension. For this reason again he will continue to be the ideal of youthful minds.—Charles A. Hawley

*The Prayer Life and Teachings of Jesus.*  
By ALBERT C. WIEAND. New York:  
Fleming H. Revell Company, 1932.  
Pp. 172. \$1.75.

The analysis of the idea of religion reveals three factors: an object which is worshiped; a subject, the worshiper; and some relation between them. These comprise religion in the historic sense.

Point of view is all-important in both philosophy and theology, and every belief whether true or false implies a kind of metaphysics. The belief and practice of prayer implies the reality of the object prayed to. Likewise one's concept of the nature of that object determines the kind of prayer offered and something of the form in which the answer is expected. What the reviewer is here trying to show is well illustrated in that interesting discussion now being carried on through the columns of the *Christian Century* by three eminent scholars. To anyone who believes there is no God prayer is a mere delusion. The nature and purpose of prayer and the form of answer expected will differ greatly between the one who believes in the personality of God and the one who believes there is a God but denies the personality of the God.

Even those who believe in the personality of God differ on the nature and purpose of prayer. Some believe its essence and purpose are thanksgiving and petition; others, to change the mind of God concerning some specific person or action; while still others that it is to bring the human mind into harmony with the divine mind. Perhaps some believe in all of these.

The author of this book has had many years experience as a teacher of the Bible and is a theologian of marked ability, while the reviewer is a teacher of philosophy of many years experience. And thus it were but natural to suppose each will view the doctrine of prayer from different positions. However, the reviewer is glad to note the author has taken a sane position from the philosopher's point of view, viz., he has gone to "life" for his facts from which he deduces his theory or principles. That is, instead of pursuing the abstract and abstruse method (as is too often the case with theologians) of shutting himself up in the cellar with drawn blinds and under artificial light proceeds to spin out a web of metaphysical figments and then to appeal to the Bible to prove his theories; and if he discovers incorrigible facts he whittles these to fit into his speculations. That is, the author's method is that of going from the concrete to the abstract by taking some concrete teaching or incident in the life of Jesus

and assuming it to embody some eternal principle or truth.

The author does not give a running discussion or exposition of the selected portion of Scripture but has arranged the contents of the book in order to lead the reader into studying the Scripture and to discover for himself or herself the truths to be learned with the further purpose to lead the pupil into an experience of the meaning, purpose, and value of prayer.

The reviewer is glad to note the author has used the inductive method of first getting the facts from some definite portion of Scripture. Then questions are asked concerning the meaning and purpose of the teachings or the motive of the actors in the event or incident being studied.

After one is thoroughly familiar with the facts, the context, the background and environing circumstances, the author follows with a series of questions to test the reader's or rather student's knowledge of the essentials embodied in the selected portion of Scripture. The book is constructed primarily for study and investigation.

A summary then follows composed of deductions made from the study. These contain the author's conceptions of the fundamental principles involved or the doctrines or life-tenants which the Lord sought to teach and to have his disciples to concrete in their own lives or to personalize in their own characters.

Few will study this book who know anything about philosophy or metaphysics, or even theology for that matter, but will be the plain, practical Christian who already believes in prayer and is seeking further light on its meaning and value. To this end of deepening the spiritual life of any who will study carefully, it is most admirably constructed. The reviewer knows of no other book quite comparable to it.—  
W. I. T. Hoover

\* \* \*

*The Fourth Gospel and the Life of Today.*  
By MARY ELY LYMAN. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931. Pp. 152. \$1.50.

Mrs. Lyman is a recognized authority on the gospel of John and this, her last book, adds to her distinguished contributions to this subject. The object of this study is to orientate readers into the world of thought from which this gospel sprang. Mrs. Lyman finds many parallels between the first century, A. D., and the present time. Old standards of authority are being broken down as they were in the chaotic world of the Mediterranean basin when John wrote at Ephesus. A medley of religious ideas

Everyone interested in Religious Education  
should read  
The Story of  
The Protestant Teachers Association of New  
York City, Inc.  
(Membership 7000 public school teachers)  
Order from the  
Protestant Teachers Association  
211 West 56th St., New York City  
Price \$1.00

is offered the average man today precisely as in the earlier time. The Fourth Gospel was written to meet certain very real moral and religious needs of the early Christian community. Since many of the conditions were the same as now, Mrs. Lyman proceeds to show the value of this gospel for today. After discussing the relation of this gospel to the synoptics she finds that John adds a more personal experience than did the other writers. In this personal experience lies the real inspiration of the gospel and its influence on the profoundest scholar and casual reader alike.—Charles A. Hawley

\* \* \*

*Mysticism East and West.* By RUDOLPH OTTO. Translated by Bertha L. Bracey and Richenda C. Payne. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932. Pp. 262. \$3.50.

*Mysticism East and West* by the famous author of *The Idea of the Holy* is not a systematic study of mysticism as is the well-known work by Evelyn Underhill. It is primarily an analytic comparison between the mysticism of the Christian devotee Eckhart and that of the Eighth Century Hindu mystic Sankara.

Yet although the work is chiefly a literary commentary, it leads to a number of fundamental conclusions, namely, the essential identity of both mystic quests, their differences owing to the different cultural soil from which they grew, and the deeper insight which we gain of the nature of mysticism from both mystics, since both were great masters of that spiritual technique.

Both Sankara and Eckhart agree in that their mysticism is not primarily metaphysics but a way of salvation and in that both start from a common theistic background. They differ chiefly in the fact that Eckhart, being an embodiment of the Gothic spirit, manifests vitality rather than quietism and a strong ethical impulse which Christianity has brought from Palestine.

The book ends with a number of appendices which are of great value. They reveal

the pervasiveness of mystical thinking in modern philosophy—primarily in Luther, Fichte, Schleiermacher and Kant. Although on page 245 Professor Otto makes some reference to the relation of the subconscious mind to the mystical awareness, he might have developed this new psychological enquiry much more fully. Modern psycho-analysts, particularly those of the Jungian school are beginning to throw a new and a sympathetic light upon the whole phenomenon of mysticism. In this connection, the brilliant essay of Jung, which is published as a commentary to the *Secret of the Golden Flower* (a book of Chinese mysticism) (Harcourt, Brace & Co., N. Y., 1931) is of surpassing interest.—Solomon B. Freehof

\* \* \*

*The Day of Worship.* Edited by WILLIAM WATTERS DAVIS. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932. Pp. 164. \$1.00.

The general secretary of the Lord's Day Alliance of Maryland has gathered a series of essays by sixteen contributors on various aspects of Sunday observance. All are in favor of the religious observance of the day. The essays are of varying excellence and of them all we thought Bishop McConnell's the best. He grounds his argument on the needs of man, rather than the command of God. In our industrial age, the need of a day of rest is especially marked. If the day is set aside, a deep obligation rests upon the church to make its ministrations so attractive and helpful that men will flock to church. Then Sunday calls us to devote ourselves to the lordliest interests of which we are capable. We have no right to any pleasure or service on Sunday which robs another man of his day of rest.

This reviewer thinks it naive of a majority of the essayists to found the observance of the day upon the fourth commandment and to urge rest on the seventh day because God rested on that day from his six-day job of making the world. Every student knows that the seven-day week and the sabbath had been developed long before Exodus was written. The book would appeal more strongly to intelligent readers if its arguments were founded on the physical and spiritual needs of man, and if it were a bit more literate. Doctor Erdman of Princeton uses "in our midst," and the lone legislator, ex-Senator Ransdell, has difficulty with "will" and "shall." The questions at the end of each essay are almost valueless because they can nearly all be answered by a simple yes or no. It would have been very easy to change them to thought provoking queries, e. g., instead of

## New York's Most Home-Like Hotel



The New  
HOTEL  
VICTORIA

(Under New Management)  
51st Street and 7th Ave.

In the heart of the City,  
within one block of  
Subways.

The location of the Victoria . . . the unusually large, tastefully appointed rooms . . . the cheerful, efficient service . . . combined with exceptionally low rates for such quality . . . make the Victoria the outstanding hotel value in New York today . . . 1000 rooms. Every room has radio, servidor, circulating ice water, bed reading lamp, and bath (tub and shower). Rates:

Single: \$3.00—\$3.50 and \$4.00  
Double: \$4.00—\$5.00 and \$6.00

Main Dining Room . . . . newly decorated. Convention Rooms.

TEA ROOM . . . . FOUNTAIN AND COFFEE SHOP  
accommodating 250 guests. Moderate prices. Delicious food and perfect service. A nice place to eat.

D. B. MULLIGAN,  
Executive Vice-Pres.

LOUIS LOW,  
Resident Manager

"Is the Lord's Day a prophecy of universal peace?" "Show in what ways," etc.

A query arises. We seem headed for the five-day week, and most of us would welcome this new development. What will our literal friends then make of the rest of the fourth commandment, "Six days shalt thou labor?"—Edwin Fairley



*Biblical Myth and Legend in Jewish Education.* By SOLOMON ANDHIL FINEBERG. New York: Behrman Jewish Book House, 1932. Pp. 155.

Inasmuch as Reform Judaism and all liberal religions are committed to a rejection of those elements in religious tradition which contradict the findings of science, the Bible is a source of continued embarrassment in child education. It can neither be wholly accepted nor entirely rejected. Its legends and myths cannot be sincerely taught as true, yet the ethical implications of many a myth-encrusted narrative are priceless in value.

Doctor Fineberg attempts to develop a technique whereby the ethical import of the Bible can be taught without inculcating its mythical material. He analyzes the various text books hitherto published and lists the

In writing to advertisers please mention RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

different ways in which the stories may be recast.

It goes without question that the stories as recast are spiritless when compared with the vivid vitality of the original Biblical narrative. For example, in place of the thrilling revelation of God's Voice at Sinai, Rabbi Fineberg says (p. 136): "A loud noise was heard—and the people thought it was the voice of God." Again instead of the weird eeriness of the scene at Endor, Rabbi Fineberg says (p. 142) "Then the woman pretended she saw Samuel."

This dullness of the recast narrative is of course inevitable. It is the price we pay for rationalizing the naïve product of genius. Whether or not this price is excessive, each teacher must decide for himself. At all events, Rabbi Fineberg has analyzed and systematized the process which all of us are haphazardly using.—Solomon B. Freehof



*Christian Worship for American Youth.* By LAURA ARMSTRONG ATHEARN. New York: The Century Company, 1931. Pp. 361. \$2.50.

This new volume in the literature on worship sets as its ambitious task the following: (1) to point out the basic reli-

gious concepts which make up a theory of worship, (2) to point out underlying psychological principles which are basic to the experience of worship for youth, (3) to take account of the resources and privileges of the church in ministering to the adolescent's need for worship, (4) to make a detailed study of the principal elements which enter into and contribute to a complete experience of worship, (5) to present a sufficient number of typical services as illustrations of the principles and methods of using the elements of worship.

The treatment in the text fulfills in a very commendable way each of these objectives. The author frankly assumes the viewpoint of Christian theism. This avoids, for the author at least, many of the problems and questions that perplex young people and their leaders alike. Whether or not this is the best and most helpful manner of dealing with worship is, of course, an open question. It is true that unless worshipers have some conception of the God they worship and some faith in the forms, words, and symbols they use, worship will mean very little. The author has a perfect right to assume a position and render the treatment of the theme accordingly.

The book represents little that is new; rather a careful and coherent statement of the problem in its totality is given. Such a statement leaders of adolescents may profitably study carefully. The book is divided into three major portions, Part I, Preparing Youth for Worship; Part II, Youth Worships; and Part III, Services of Worship. The treatment is quite traditional throughout. The interpretation of the various elements in their use in worship is enriching, especially the chapters dealing with music and art. The services of worship which are introduced as illustrative add to that growing body of material which should serve to place ample resources at the disposal of the worship leader.

Many readers will wish that the author might have departed somewhat from the traditional pathways to wrestle with the problems the scientifically-minded, psychologically-alert, and socially-sensitive leaders and youth are themselves concerned with and to the solution of which worship may make a significant contribution.—*Frank M. McKibben*

38 38 38

*Men Who Stood Alone.* By MARY JENNESS. New York: Ray Long & Richard R. Smith, 1932. Pp. 114. \$1.00.

In this little book of 114 pages, Miss Jenness reveals her ability to take difficult

In writing to advertisers please mention RELIGIOUS EDUCATION



There is a Hotel in  
NEW YORK  
That allows a SPECIAL RATE  
to EDUCATORS and CLERGYMEN  
from all over the World

A HOME IN THE HEART OF  
THINGS

Near Largest Department Stores...  
Convenient to Theatres... Opposite  
Famous Churches... In the midst of  
the city but away from the Noise.

Largest Hotel Lounge in New York... Educators  
Room... Library... Radio Rooms... Coffee Shop

A Recommended Hotel

1000 ROOMS WITH BATH

For One From	For Two From	For Three From
\$2.50	\$4.00	\$4.50

PRINCE GEORGE HOTEL

Fifth Avenue and 28th Street  
NEW YORK

ALBURN M. GUTTERSON  
MANAGER



## STUDY RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

HARTFORD training prepares lay workers for salaried positions. Thoroughly modern courses for men and women in interdenominational school. Over 225 courses available in the three schools on our spacious campus. At least 2 years' college or normal work prerequisite. Degrees B.R.E., M.A., M.R.E., Ph.D. Address

KARL R. STOLZ, Ph.D., D.D., *Dean*  
Hartford, Connecticut

### HARTFORD

Seminary Foundation

Robbins W. Barstow, D.D., *President*

and ancient records and bring them to life through imaginative writing. She has selected from the records of the Hebrew prophets, Elisha, Elijah, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Ezekiel, "the great unknown," Jonah, Daniel and John the Baptist, certain dramatic episodes and has told them with a wealth of vivid picturing and with skilled characterizations.

Young people and teachers seeking to supplement the obscure biblical books of the prophets and the commentaries of scholars, with something understandable and interesting will find the book of fine service. It would be unreasonable, however, to rely on such brief and necessarily sketchy narratives to give satisfying impressions of these great men. Not infrequently, Miss Jenness crowds into a subordinate sentence clause a reference to a complex situation of vital significance to an appreciation of the drama of the story. The book should be regarded merely as an extra resource to liven the imaginations of those who are trying to study the prophets.

I regret that Miss Jenness is not thoroughgoing in her acceptance of the findings of archeology and biblical scholarship. It may be well to tell those who go to the book expecting a modern interpretation of the old Bible stories, that the first two stories in the book are from this angle perhaps the weakest.

The story of Elisha is told as the true story of an other-worldly miracle-worker, and Elijah's contest on Mount Carmel is the story of the contest between an ideal man worshiping the "one true God" and the prophets of the heathen Baal. In fact

In writing to advertisers please mention RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

throughout the book the impression is given that the prophets are men, with no faults or mistaken conceptions, struggling against the sensuous heathen worship of false gods, instead of men fighting the formalism and sensuality and greed and self-seeking in the worship of Yahweh, their own national god, who the franker scholars admit early became the *Baal* or Lord of the land. There is evidence to show that Yahweh's images were in the high places and even in the temple itself, and his worshipers indulged in wine-drinking, dancing, sensuous orgies, self-torture, and even child sacrifice, and Yahweh's priests used oracles and magic and ecstatic trances in their ritual. Although it is questionable how many of the prophets whose stories are told in this book really held a truly monotheistic faith, they are all presented as champions of "the one true God." This tendency to idealize the religion of the Hebrew people is part of the church's heritage. Miss Jenness can point to a number of well-known authorities to support her position, and this which the present reviewer considers a weakness will no doubt by many be regarded as a virtue.

—Sophia Lyon Fahs

\* \* \*

*Selfhood and Sacrifice.* By FRANK GAVIN. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Company, 1932. Pp. 84. \$1.00.

This brief book of sermons expounds the seven sayings attributed to Jesus as he hung upon the cross. From the point of view of modern criticism the book is entirely traditional. The preacher accepts the sayings attributed to Jesus in the fourth gospel as no less authentic than those found in Mark and Luke. The conception of Jesus assumed without question is also traditional and most modern scholars would go further and say that it is excessively sentimental. For example, one has to blind his eyes to a good deal in the first three gospels, e. g., Matthew 23, to be able to say: "Our dear Lord is the supreme example of spiritual maturity. He was never once ill at ease. He was never taken aback, never self-conscious." The author as a professor of ecclesiastical history is doubtless familiar with modern critical lives of Jesus, like that of Professor Case, but he has been entirely untouched by them. For critical readers the book will not have much value.

But for those whose religious thought and life move contentedly within traditional lines these sermons may well prove suggestive and inspiring. They are direct and pointed and practical and evince a good deal of knowledge of the human heart. The preacher

is in earnest, believes his *credo* with all his heart and utters his convictions with a nervous energy begotten of the knowledge that the faith he upholds is being challenged by all the sciences, physical, mental, and historical, that are being built up in our modern universities.—*Robert J. Hutcheon*

\* \* \*

*Founders of Great Religions.* By MILLAR BURROWS. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931. Pp. 240. \$2.00.

This excellent book differs from similar works by a rare quality, the absence of an apologetic attitude. Doctor Burrows possesses a deeply religious nature. He realizes the difficulty in applying an objective method of study to one's own religion as one would to other religions. Yet he feels it must be attempted, otherwise there could be no fair basis of comparison. He stresses the fact that an understanding of the religion of other peoples is necessary for a true understanding of one's own and the basis of such understanding he finds in a study of the life and teachings of the various founders. The object of his book is not to prove that one founder is better than another, but simply to find what they have in common and wherein they differ. Doctor Burrows has written a collection of personal sketches of the nine men who were the founders of the principal religions of the world. In writing his sketches, Doctor Burrows aims less at historical accuracy than at the faithful picture of the impression which the life of the various founders made on the life and the imagination of their people. In dealing with the life of Moses, for instance, he draws largely on the excellent collection of folktales contained in Edmond Fleg's biography of Moses.

The last chapter contains a summary with the closing words: "The variety of their creeds and points of view makes all the more significant the things the founders held in common. . . . In the recognition of some ruling power in the universe, and in the faith that is on the side of righteousness, the personally founded religions are at one."

—M. Jung

\* \* \*

*Taming Our Machines.* By RALPH E. FLANDERS. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931. Pp. 244. \$2.50.

A short account of the rise of the machine age, with a statement of its implications. The book gives a very excellent

<b>RADIO</b>	<b>CAMERAS</b>
<b>PHONOGRAPHS</b>	<b>MOTION</b>
<b>RECORDS</b>	<b>PICTURE</b>
	<b>EQUIPMENT</b>
	(35 mm. and 16 mm.)
RCA Victor	Eastman
Westinghouse	Bell and Howell
Stromberg Carlson	Carl Zeiss
Atwater Kent	Victor
Capehart	Leica
Columbia	Bausch and Lomb

## Rab Sons

1373 Sixth Avenue  
(Near 56th Street)

New York City

<b>Sporting Goods</b>	<b>Vacuum Cleaners</b>
A. G. Spalding	Sewing Machines
Sun Lamps	Fountain Pens
	Telechron Clocks

A Department is especially equipped to bid on equipment for church and college use.

(Music furnished at R. E. A. Convention at Columbia University by Rab Sons.)

## CREATIVE EXPRESSION

Creative Expression through Art, Music, Literature, Dramatics

These four valuable previous issues of PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION now re-edited by Gertrude Hartman and Ann Shumaker, and reprinted in one volume by the John Day Company.

Fifty-seven articles by leaders in their respective fields.

One hundred and sixty-seven illustrations and drawings.

Fifty-three drawings in color.

One hundred twenty-eight examples of children's work.

This edition is handsomely and durably bound—a permanent library book for continuous reference.

Limited Edition      Price—\$5.00 per copy

Progressive Education Association, Dept. E.  
116 Jackson Place,  
Washington, D. C.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Enclosed is my check for \$\_\_\_\_\_ for which send  
me one copy (\_\_\_\_\_ copies) of CREATIVE EXPRESSION.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

JOHN H. FINLEY, President of the Religious Education Association, was Commissioner of Education of the State of New York and president of the University of the State of New York from 1913-21. Since 1921 he has been associate editor of the *New York Times*.

GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM was Attorney General of the United States in the cabinet of President Taft, and was chairman of the National Commission on Law Observance and Law Enforcement appointed by President Hoover. He has been, since 1914, a member of the law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft.

J. V. MOLDENHAWER is minister of the First Presbyterian Church, New York City.

JAMES M. GILLIS has been the editor of *The Catholic World* since 1922.

LOUIS L. MANN is the rabbi of Chicago Sinai Congregation and professor of Oriental Languages and Literatures at the University of Chicago.

GEORGE JOHNSON directs the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

FRED J. KELLY, former president of the University of Idaho, is now Chief of the Division of Colleges and Professional Schools of the United States Office of Education.

PHILIP A. PARSONS is Dean of the School of Applied Social Science, the University of Oregon.

JACOB KOHN, formerly professor of Jewish Literature at Teachers College, Columbia University, is now rabbi of Congregation Sinai in Los Angeles.

M. WILLARD LAMPE directs the School of Religion at the State University of Iowa.

LEWIS B. HILLIS is Director of the Westminster Foundation at the University of California in Berkeley.

EDWARD W. BLAKEMAN is Director of the Wesley Foundation at the University of Michigan.

analysis of the meaning and the effects of the industrial era, and what may be accomplished with the machine. There is a very good chapter on "Russian Planning vs. American," in which the author attempts to show that there ought to be some attempt made in the direction of economic planning. "Since the most effective external cause of fear lies in the uncertainty of employment in the varying stages of the business cycle, this is inevitably the area we would first select in any attempt to see whether there is a field for social planning of the flexible, organic American type."

The author proposes the establishment of an authoritative body properly organized and adequately financed for the purpose, whose members or experts shall make an exhaustive study along five fronts, viz., "(a) the different phases of the business cycle, (b) the various elements of the social mechanism—farming, transportation, manufacture, selling, etc., (c) the responsibilities of the individuals, business, banking, government, (d) the reactions between each item and the proposals and view points, and, finally (e) its probable effect on the stabilization of business and the raising of the standards of living." The results of these studies to form the basis of such procedure as will inure to the best welfare of the land.

The author is an optimist who believes that we possess the intelligence, the wealth and the will to utilize the benefits of the machine without permitting it to be an instrument of destruction. If there has been an unleashed and undirected industrial mechanization thus far, it need not be assumed that the economic illnesses that it has produced are incurable. On the other hand, "Our age approaches its majority. Led hitherto by instinct and the blind course of events, we have come to that recurrent and inevitable moment where we must give conscious direction to that course. No previous civilization has possessed the required resources of intelligence, experience, energy and good will. With all these arms we are well equipped. Why evade or deny the project? Why be doubtful of the outcome?"

The *Taming of Machines* is one of the few optimistic approaches to a problem which seems to be the cause of a reversal of present human values. The book is a thoughtful exposition of the economic problem in which we are floundering, with a hint as to its possible solution. One may not agree with the author's philosophy, but it evokes the most earnest thought.

The author classifies the valid satisfactions as follows: satisfaction of the senses; func-



## 10% Reduction to Educators on Hotel Rates

YOU would find yourself in a congenial atmosphere at the Herald Square Hotel. It is a medium-sized comfortable house and seems more like a home.

And it is so centrally located at 34th St. and Broadway, on all main transit lines, that you'll save many minutes getting about town. A block from Penn Station. A B. & O. bus stop.

### Cozy, quiet rooms—you will sleep

To educators we allow a 10% reduction from our regular rates of \$2 up for single room and \$3 up for double room with detached bath, or \$2.50 up single and \$3.50 up double, with private bath. Also surprisingly low weekly rates.

We would be pleased to welcome you as a guest.

IGNATIUS M. WIESE, Manager.

## HERALD SQUARE HOTEL

116 W. 34th St., at Broadway, New York City

A. B. & O. Bus Stop Directly opposite Macy's Block to Penn. Station

tional satisfactions; enlargement of the personality; objective achievement; social integration; overtones and harmonies—the field of esthetics; cosmic integration. He develops these and shows how each has a place in our machine civilization, if it is properly directed. The Good Life can be achieved, if our efforts are based solidly on experience, and not left entirely to "conventional morality and religious teaching."—*G. George Fox*

\* \* \*

### Books Received

Addams, Jane, *The Excellent Becomes the Permanent*. Macmillan.

Brawley, Benjamin, *History of the English Hymn*. Abingdon.

Brian, Chaninov, *The Russian Church*. Macmillan.

Brightman, Edgar Sheffield, *Is God a Person?* Association.

Bundy, W. E., *A Syllabus and Synopsis of the First Three Gospels*. Bobbs Merrill.

Counts, George, *The Soviet Challenge to America*. John Day.

Heiler, F., *Prayer*. Oxford University Press.

Kulp, Daniel H., *Educational Sociology*. Longmans Green.

McAll, Reginald L., *Practical Church School Music*. Abingdon.

McCall, Oswald W. S., *The Uses of Literature in the Pulpit*. Harper.

Manson, T. W., *The Teaching of Jesus*. Macmillan.

Morgan, J. J. B., and Webb, E., *Making the Most of Your Life*. R. Long & R. R. Smith.

Newton, Joseph Fort, *If I Had Only One Sermon to Prepare*. Harper.

O'Neil, Jerold, *Today's Boy and Today's Problems*. Holston House.

Purinton, Carl Everett, *The Re-interpretation of Jesus in the New Testament*. Scribner's.

Smith, Roy L., *Winning Ways for Working Churches*. Abingdon.

Soule, George, *A Planned Society*. Macmillan.

Trout, David M., *Religious Behavior*. Macmillan.

Vulliamy, C. E., *John Wesley*. Scribner's.

Wolfenden, J. F., *The Approach to Philosophy*. Longmans Green.

---

## A Modern Interpretation

No longer does religion signify rigid doctrines which, when brought into contact with one another, cause unpleasant friction. Rather it is absorbing the technical divisions of creeds into a firmer belief which not only withstands the queries of science, but harmonizes with its developments. So, in keeping with this spirit, **The Journal of Religion** does not attempt to defend a doctrinal system. The emphasis is on the interrelationship between religious life and the social environment. It is a journal for the serious reader who is interested in religion as a living, spiritual reality in society, in history, and in individual experience.

---

## The JOURNAL OF RELIGION

---

Edited by Shirley Jackson Case  
Subscription price, \$4.00  
Single copy, \$1.25

●

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
5750 Ellis Avenue Chicago, Illinois

---

